COMPLETED
161
Y4.L11/4:S.hrg.99-397
FEB 18 1986

S. Hrg. 99-397

NOMINATIONS

M114
ORIGINAL

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

JOHN NORTON MOORE, OF VIRGINIA, W. SCOTT THOMPSON, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, EVRON M. KIRKPATRICK, OF MARYLAND, DENNIS L. BARK, OF CALIFORNIA, W. BRUCE WEINROD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, SIDNEY LOVETT, OF CONNECTICUT, RICHARD JOHN NEUHAUS, OF NEW YORK, AND ALLEN WEINSTEIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

OCTOBER 24, 1985

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
56-169 O WASHINGTON : 1986

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah, *Chairman*

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont	EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana	CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
DON NICKLES, Oklahoma	HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
PAULA HAWKINS, Florida	SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina	CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr., Connecticut	PAUL SIMON, Illinois
MALCOLM WALLOP, Wyoming	JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa	

RONALD F. DOCKSAI, *Staff Director*
KATHRYN O'L. HIGGINS, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1985

Bark, Dennis, of Stanford, CA 78
    Prepared statement 79
    Biographical sketch 82
Glickman, Hon. Dan, a U.S. Representative in Congress from the State of Kansas, prepared statement 4
Kirkpatrick, Evron, of Bethesda, MD 68
    Biographical sketch 69
Lovett, Sidney, of West Hartford, CT 113
    Prepared statement 114
    Biographical sketch 116
Matsunaga, Hon. Spark M., a U.S. Senator from the State of Hawaii, prepared statement 13
Moore, John Norton, of Charlottesville, VA 22
    Prepared statement 24
    Biographical sketch 30
Neuhaus, Richard, of New York, NY 123
    Biographical sketch 124
Thompson, Scott, of Amissville, VA 58
    Prepared statement 60
    Biographical sketch 62
Warner, Hon. John, a U.S. Senator from the State of Virginia, prepared statement 20
Weicker, Hon. Lowell, Jr., a U.S. Senator from the State of Connecticut, prepared statement 8
Weinrod, Bruce W., of Washington, DC 92
    Prepared statement 94
    Biographical sketch 100
Weinstein, Allen, of Washington, DC 132
    Biographical sketch 134

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

Communications to:
    Hatch, Hon. Orrin G., a U.S. Senator from the State of Utah, from Paul Trible, October 23, 1985 19
Questions and answers:
    Responses of Professor Moore to questions submitted by committee 53
    Responses of Mr. Thompson to questions submitted by committee 67
    Responses of Dr. Kirkpatrick to questions submitted by committee 76
    Responses of Dr. Bark to questions submitted to him by committee 89
    Responses of Mr. Weinrod to questions submitted by committee 107
    Responses of Mr. Lovett to questions submitted by committee 121
    Responses of Mr. Neuhaus to questions submitted by committee 129
    Responses of Dr. Weinstein to questions submitted by committee 149

NOMINATION

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1985

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:08 a.m., in room 430, of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Robert T. Stafford and Senator Mark O. Hatfield copresiding.

Present: Senators Stafford, Hatfield, Weicker, Matsunaga, and Pell.

Also present: Senator Randolph.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR STAFFORD

Senator STAFFORD. The Committee on Labor and Human Resources will come to order. I know that Senator Hatfield, who is cochair of this with me, will be over here as soon as he can, and I am delighted that Senator Weicker and Senator Matsunaga are here to join us—and Senator Randolph, without whose tireless effort we would not be holding this meeting this morning.

We are here to consider eight nominees for the Board of Directors of the long-awaited U.S. Institute of Peace. I notice that Mr. Neuhaus isn't here yet, but I trust he will be able to break through the traffic some time before this is concluded.

I'm glad to be able to chair the hearing for Senator Hatch, who is unable to be here this morning—and I am extremely pleased to share the chair with Senator Mark Hatfield whose efforts in the establishment of the U.S. Institute of Peace were invaluable.

As I see many of those who were instrumental in establishing the Peace Institute, I would like to convey a special welcome to Senator Jennings Randolph. In 1945, Senator Randolph pioneered efforts to create a peace institution by introducing in the House of Representatives a bill to establish a Department of Peace. His tireless advocacy of this idea was the main driving force behind the Peace Institute. It is clear through his presence today that his dedication continues. We thank you for being here.

I would also like to acknowledge a member of our committee, Senator Spark Matsunaga. In 1979, he was chairman of the Commission of Proposals for the National Peace Academy, and was later the original sponsor of the Senate bill. I commend him for his past and present leadership.

The United States needs an institution to coordinate peace research activities, conflict resolution training, and information services to ensure that we are adequately prepared and trained to pursue, to the fullest extent possible, peaceful solutions to conflict.

Yet, as important as it is for us to commit ourselves to enhancing this Nation's conflict resolution capabilities, we must make very sure that the institute works effectively to achieve our intended goals.

I welcome the nominees here today and look forward to hearing their statements. But first we will insert the opening statements of Senator Hatfield and Senator Pell into the record at this point.

[The opening statements of Senators Hatfield and Pell follow:]

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR HATFIELD

Senator **Hatfield**. Mr. Chairman, it is an honor to be asked to cochair this event, and I am grateful to the members of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, especially Senator Stafford, for allowing me to join them.

The U.S. Institute of Peace has a rich legislative history. Since the birth of our Nation legislators have advocated the creation of an institution dedicated to peace. Senators Matthew Neely, Jennings Randolph, Vance Hartke, Spark Matsunaga, Robert Stafford, and many others make up the long and distinguished list of supporters. My interest in waging peace caused me to cosponsor the Peace Academy legislation of 1976. But now the years of speeches, articles, commissions, and reports are over, and the Institute is very close to becoming a functioning institution.

Parallel to this legislative history is the interest and support for this Institute generated by the citizens of our Nation. Peace is a desire of all humans. A nation at war is a nation fighting for its survival. Americans have long recognized the need for peace, and the need to have an institution which will look beyond the superficial causes of conflict. Just as we have many ideas on how a war should be waged, we must ask how to wage peace. We realize the need for the U.S. Institute of Peace, which will conduct research and provide education and training in conflict resolution. Our country spends a large portion of its creative manpower and energy, not to mention trillions of dollars, on its warmaking capabilities. In its preparation for war the Pentagon spends an average of $28 million every hour of every day. As we sit in this hearing room the military will spend over three times the amount of money authorized to run the Peace Institute for 2 years.

The Institute is not to be an arm of the Government, nor is it to be an exclusive think tank which sequesters information, making it available only to scholars and experts. The U.S. Institute of Peace is a response to the demonstrated lack of information on disciplines in the social, behavorial, and physical sciences, all of which provide insight into the techniques required to obtain and maintain peace. The U.S. Institute of Peace provides great promise, grounded by the desire of all mankind to live in a world free from the threat of extinction. The men—and hopefully women—who serve as the first Board of Directors will have the responsibility of nuturing the U.S. Institute of Peace from infancy, a heavy yet enviable responsibility.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR PELL

Senator **Pell**. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that we are holding this confirmation hearing for nominees to the Board of Directors of the U.S. Institute of Peace. As one who cosponsored the legislation to create the Institute, I regret that the President has delayed in sending these nominations to the Senate. In my view, that delay has served only to undermine our quest for peace.

The legislation to create a peace institute was the outgrowth of the work and recommendations of the Commission on Proposals for the National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution. This Commission was provided for in the Education Amendments Act of 1978, Public Law 95-561. At that time, I had the privilege of chairing the Education Subcommittee. I am pleased to see how far we have come since then—from idea to legislation to naming the Board.

The primary purpose of the Peace Institute is to enhance current research and training in the fields of conflict resolution, diplomacy, international affairs, and peace studies. The Institute has the authority to engage in its own research and training, to make grants to existing institutions to carry out programs in these areas, and to publish and disseminate the results of its research.

Given the ongoing nuclear arms race between the United States and in the Soviet Union, the growing number of terrorist incidents, and the tumoil in the Middle East, Central America, and other parts of the world, it is imperative that we make every effort to increase our understanding about the causes of war and the sources of conflict in order that peace may be achieved. I believe that the Peace Institute can contribute substantially toward this end if its authorities are used effectively and fully. I look forward to hearing the nominee's views on this matter.

Senator Stafford. At this time I would like to insert a statement from Congressman Dan Glickman into the hearing record. Congressman Glickman led the way in the House of Representatives for the passage of the Peace Institute bill, and continues to provide leadership in that area. And, without objection, we will place his statement in the record.

[The prepared statement by Congressman Glickman follows:]

Statement by
Representative Dan Glickman (4th District/Kansas)
October 24, 1985
Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources

Today is a most important day and, unfortunately, one that has been too long in coming. This morning's hearing marks another step in the long-awaited establishment of the United States Institute of Peace. As the principal sponsor in the House of legislation to create the Institute of Peace, I would like to share with the Committee and the nominees a few words of concern.

As I study the list of nominees, I am struck, not so much by what is there, but by what is missing. Noticeably absent from the nominees submitted thus far are practicioners in conflict resolution. Absent as well are nominees from regions of the country other than the East or West Coast. There is an imbalance also in the professions represented: think tanks and partisan organizations predominate.

However, these concerns of professional and regional representation are superceded by the most basic concern: are these nominees committed to establishing the United States Institute of Peace in accordance with the law and the intent of Congress?

I raise this question because there have been signs that the Administration is resisting compliance with the mandate of Congress on the Institute. The fact that today's hearing comes a full six months after the statutory deadline for the submission of Board nominees is indicative of that resistance. In a like manner, the Administration's deferral of Peace Institute funding last January showed, if not outright opposition to the Institute, at least a lack of support for or interest in giving organization of the Institute priority attention. Likewise, the Administration's appointment of persons who, prior to appointment, had no knowledge whatsover of the Peace Institute's charter or legislative history puts to question the President's earnestness in establishing an effective Institute.

Regardless of intentions, these actions have had a dilatory effect on the actual establishment of the Institute. And now that we are at this crucial step--the organization of the Institute's Board of Directors--I want to make sure that we are actually moving ahead. I want to know that the pending nominees will not stop the Institute dead in its tracks: that these nominees have not been appointed to kill the Institute or reshape it in ways contrary to what Congress envisioned.

Let me briefly describe what Congress envisioned. Proposals to establish a United States Institute of Peace were introduced in the House and the Senate late in the 97th Congress. They were based on the recommendations of a Congressionally-created Commission which concluded, after nationwide hearings, that a centralized institution was needed to coordinate this country's fragmented efforts in peace and conflict resolution.

Witness after witness testified that in recent years teachable, cost-effective, non-violent methods of resolving conflicts had been developed. However, many witnesses voiced their concern that international disputes over natural resources, the environment, international commerce and the arms race had the potential for escalating into violence if current knowledge of peaceful conflict resolution was not more fully integrated into diplomacy, business, and policy planning.

A little more than a year ago, legislation authorizing the Institute of Peace was finally signed into law. The record created through Congressional hearings and Committee and floor action is clear as to our intent in creating the Institute. The primary purpose of the Institute is to provide and fund research, training and information dissemination in effective and appropriate techniques and theories promoting international peace and the resolution of conflict without recourse to violence. These goals can be carried out through several avenues: the operation of the Institute's own programs, symposia, conferences and public activities; grants to existing institutions to carry out their own programs; and cooperative arrangements between the Institute, existing institutions or consortia of such institutions.

The record is clear that the Institute is to be an independent entity, not an appendage of an existing agency or department. It will in no way perform a policy implementation or interventionist role.

Unlike existing schools of diplomacy, the Institute of Peace will be a resource for all Americans. Its programs are to make research, education and information more available not only to persons in the government, but to persons in the business community, educational community, and voluntary associations, as well.

In conclusion, the size, sophistication and destructive capability of the world's weapons arsenals compel us to seek with profound seriousness all avenues to preventing armed conflict. And yet, as a nation, we have directed little attention to non-military solutions to resolving international conflict. President and General Dwight D. Eisenhower's warning in his memoirs, Waging Peace, still rings true today: "there is an imbalance in our national means of seeking security and liberty, and an undue reliance on methods of power and force in managing conflict." In his farewell address, he urged for "the proper meshing of the huge military and industrial machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals."

Congress has taken a significant step in that direction by creating the United States Institute of Peace. The nominees assembled today are charged with the task of carrying out the will of Congress in organizing and operating the Institute. Their commitment to that charge must be clear and unequivocal. Assuring that is the case rests with the Senate.

Senator **Stafford**. As I see many of those who were instrumental in establishing the Peace Institute, I would like to convey a special welcome to all of them who are here. I have noted Senator Randolph's efforts, which began in 1945, to create a peace institution by introducing in the House of Representatives a bill to establish a Department of Peace—and I think that probably antecedes any other effort by anybody to create this institution.

His tireless advocacy of this idea was the main driving force behind the peace initiative. It is clear, through his presence today, that his dedication continues, and we thank you, Jennings, for being here with us.

I would also like to acknowledge a member of our committee, Senator Spark Matsunaga. In 1979 he was Chairman of the Commission on Proposals for the National Peace Academy and was later the original sponsor of the Senate bill.

I commend him for his past and present leadership.

The United States needs an institution to coordinate peace research activities, conflict-resolution training, and trained to pursue, to the fullest extent possible, peaceful solutions to conflict.

Yet, as important as it is for us to commit ourselves to enhancing this Nation's conflict-resolution capabilities, we must make sure that the Institute works effectively to achieve our intended goals.

I welcome all of the nominees here today and look forward to hearing their statements.

Meantime, Senator Weicker, do you have any opening statement?

Senator **Weicker**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I know that Senator Hatfield would like to be with you, but I suspect he's going to be on the floor for quite a few moments, as he has amendments on the State Justice bill, which is where I have to go.

There are two things I'd like to do. I would first like to commend to the attention of the committee the nomination of John Norton Moore to be Chairman of the Board of the Institute of Peace.

I have known John for quite a few years now, sharing a similar interest in marine research and in the oceans, he going beyond that as director of both the center for ocean law and policy and the center for law and national security at the University of Virginia School of Law.

I think that John is eminently qualified for the position both in terms of his mind and in terms of the spirit that he will bring to it.

And I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my statement be placed in the record.

I also would like to take the occasion, Mr. Chairman, to introduce his lovely wife, Barbara, who I think is in the room, who was a member of my staff for many years, and who is a superb scuba diver. Barbara, do you want to go ahead and stand up? [Applause.]

Senator **Stafford**. Without objection, your full statement will be in the record.

Senator **Weicker**. Barbara, while he is busy on his duties, any time you want to go Scuba diving, let's the two of us do it and let him pay attention to business.

In any event, John, good luck to you in your endeavors—I know you are going to bring great distinction to the position.

Dr. **Moore**. Thank you very much.

Senator **Weicker**. And I also notice that I have another constituent here, the Reverend Sidney Lovett of West Hartford, and, again, Reverend Lovett, welcome, nice to have you here, and I am sure that these are duties which you will launch upon with enthusiasm and great ability.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Senator Weicker follows:]

OCTOBER 24, 1985

STATEMENT OF SENATOR LOWELL WEICKER, JR. ON THE NOMINATION OF JOHN NORTON MOORE TO BE THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF THE INSTITUTE OF PEACE

MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE TO INTRODUCE JOHN NORTON MOORE, NOMINEE FOR CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE.

JOHN MOORE'S UNIQUE COMBINATION OF ACADEMIC AND PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE IN MATTERS OF PEACE AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION IS REMARKABLE. HE IS CURRENTLY THE DIRECTOR OF BOTH THE CENTER FOR OCEAN LAW AND POLICY AND THE CENTER FOR LAW AND NATIONAL SECURITY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA SCHOOL OF LAW. DR. MOORE HAS AUTHORED NUMEROUS BOOKS AND ARTICLES ON INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT ON TOPICS RANGING FROM TERRORISM TO OCEAN POLICIES.

JOHN MOORE'S EXPERIENCE, BOTH WITHIN GOVERNMENT AND WITH VARIOUS AGENCIES CONCERNED WITH CONFLICT RESOLUTION, IS EXTENSIVE. AS CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL'S

INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE ON THE LAW OF SEA, AS U.S. AMBASSADOR TO THE LAW OF THE SEA CONFERENCE, AND AS A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE, HE HAS MADE A SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION TO U.S. MARINE POLICY AT BOTH NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEVELS. MR. MOORE SERVED AS A MEMBER OF THE U.S. DELEGATION TO OBSERVE THE ELECTIONS IN EL SALVADOR AND WAS A MEMBER OF THE U.S. DELEGATION TO THE UNITED NATION'S GENERAL ASSEMBLY FROM 1972-1975.

THE MISSION OF THE INSTITUTE OF PEACE IS STRAIGHTFORWARD: "TO SERVE PEOPLE AND THE GOVERNMENT THROUGH THE WIDEST POSSIBLE RANGE OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING, BASIC AND APPLIED RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES, AND PEACE INFORMATION SERVICES ON THE MEANS TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND THE RESOLUTION OF CONFLICTS AMONG THE NATIONS AND PEOPLES OF THE WORLD WITHOUT RECOURSE TO VIOLENCE." THIS IS AN IMPORTANT MISSION, ONE THAT DEMANDS A LEADER WITH COMMITMENT AND EXPERIENCE. JOHN MOORE HAS ACTIVELY DEMONSTRATED HIS COMMITMENT TO THE U.S. INSTITUTE OF PEACE AND HAS A BROAD RANGE OF EXPERIENCE WHICH QUALIFIES HIM AS A NOMINEE. I WOULD LIKE TO OFFER MY SUPPORT FOR JOHN MOORE AS CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF THE INSTITUTE OF PEACE.

Senator **Stafford**. Thank you, Senator Weicker. Senator Matsunaga?

Senator **Matsunaga**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I greatly appreciate your continued support of the U.S. Institute of Peace and your assistance in arranging prompt hearings on the President's nominees for the Institute's Board of Directors.

The importance of these hearings cannot be over-emphasized, for the success or failure of the Peace Institute will depend upon the caliber, integrity, foresight, dedication, and basic philosophy of the members of the Board.

By way of background, legislation to establish the U.S. Institute of Peace was passed by the Congress last year and signed into law by President Reagan on October 19, 1984, 201 years after such an agency was first proposed in 1793. Benjamin Banneker, one of the authors of that first proposal, in an article in Banneker's Almanac, lamented the lack of any provision for a U.S. Peace Office in the newly ratified U.S. Constitution.

In proposing that such an agency be established, he said—and I quote: "It is to be hoped that no objection will be made to the establishment of such an office while we are at war with the Indians, or, as the War Office of the U.S. was established in time of peace, it is equally reasonable that a Peace Office be established in time of war."

Since then, for over 200 years, in peace and war, Americans have continued to view world peace as a vital part of our national heritage and as essential to our national security.

Proposals for a national agency devoted to peace research and education, which would complement but not replace the present U.S. Department of Defense, and its predecessor agencies, have been advanced throughout our history by men and women of vision and stature, both in the public and private sectors.

But the U.S. Institute of Peace is based specifically on the findings and recommendations of the Commission on Proposals for the National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution.

The nine-member Commission which I chaired was established by Congress in 1979 to review the various proposals for a National Peace Academy, examine a variety of alternatives, and recommend appropriate action to Congress. Three of its members were appointed by the President, three by the Speaker of the House, three by the President pro tempore of the Senate.

In its report, published in 1981, the Commission recommended the establishment of an independent Federal agency which would (1) conduct research of its own and fund research by other organizations and institutions, (2) offer graduate and post-graduate education and training and continuing education services for individuals in both the public and private sectors, and (3) establish an information service which would gather and disseminate information relating to peace research, training, and education.

In pursuit of its purposes, and to honor the recently retired Senator from West Virginia, who was a principal cosponsor of the enabling legislation and had introduced similar legislation as early as 1945, the Institute would establish the Jennings Randolph Center for International Peace to which leaders and potential leaders from this Nation and other nations would be appointed to study the art of peacemaking.

The Commission strongly recommended that the new agency be independent, and Congress endorsed this concept in passing the legislation which established the Institute. It is prohibited from lobbying Congress and participating in the policymaking functions of other Government departments and agencies. Furthermore, it is prohibited from intervening in any international dispute. Although ex officio members of the Board of Directors include the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the President of the National Defense University, or their designees, the Institute is not to be a mere extension of the State Department, the Defense Department, the ACDA, or the National Defense University.

By insulating the Institute from day-to-day policy-making, Congress intended to leave it free to conduct research and inquiry into the causes of war, the prevention of war, and new techniques for resolving conflict, unfettered by the institutional constraints facing these agencies with their focus on prevailing policy.

In fact, proposals to link the Institute more closely with the State Department and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency were specifically rejected, first by the Commission on Proposals for the National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution, and then by the Committee on Labor and Human Resources—that's this committee.

Soon after the Commission's report was published in 1981, I introduced legislation to carry out its recommendations, with Senator Jennings Randolph and Senator Mark Hatfield as cosponsors. In previous years, only Senators Randolph and Hatfield would cosponsor such legislation with me, but with the publication and distribution of the Commission report with its detailed plan for a national peace agency, I was able to obtain the cosponsorship of 54 Senators.

The measure was reintroduced early in the 98th Congress with 55 cosponsors, including myself.

And to avoid a threatened Presidential veto, that bill, S. 564, was attached as an amendment to the Defense Department authorization bill for 1985. It survived the intense scrutiny of the House-Senate conference committee with relatively minor changes. The conferees changed the name of the agency, the U.S. Academy of Peace, to the U.S. Institute of Peace, and deleted $7.5 million authorized for lease or purchase of the Institute's Washington headquarters. The Institute was directed to obtain its headquarters space through the General Services Administration.

Now, the amount of support which the new Institute has received in Congress and from the general public has been truly amazing. Since the enactment of the new law, we have been eagerly awaiting President Reagan's nomination of the 11 private-sector members of the Institute's Board of Directors. To our great disappointment, the President missed the statutory deadline for submitting his nominations to Congress, which was on April 20, 1985—6 months after enactment of legislation, 3 months after his inauguration. We were told repeatedly that this was due to lengthy delays in the security clearance process.

Frankly, I'm a bit skeptical about that. The same clearance process is used to evaluate candidates for other major Federal posts as well as those nominated for the Board of Directors of the Institute of Peace. If it does indeed take a full year to clear candidates for Federal position, then the clearance process needs a major overhaul. Conceivably it could bring the Federal Government to a complete standstill one of these days.

It is also disappointing to note, without any reflection upon the nominees here, that President Reagan did not use his authority to nominate a more diverse slate of candidates. For example, the Board includes no business leaders, no labor leaders, no civil rights leaders, and no professional in the field of conflict resolution, with the possible exception of one or two.

Although the American Association of University Women and the YWCA were among the earliest and staunchest advocates of the U.S. Institute of Peace, no women were nominated to serve on the Institute's Board of Directors.

Finally, the candidates for the Board of Directors were selected from the northeast-middle Atlantic region and the west coast, with no representation from the Midwest or the South.

The Board's lack of diversity is no trivial matter, for one of its major tasks will be to develop and conduct outreach programs which will include a broad cross-section of the American public in the Institute's activities. It would also be establishing policies and procedures for awarding grants and contracts to other organizations and educational institutions interested in developing or strengthening peace research and education programs.

President Reagan has to date nominated only 8 of the 11 private-sector members of the Board. And I do hope that he will try to remedy this law when he makes his next three and final nominations.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to make this opening statement, which may be somewhat of an orientation for some of the nominees, and I am looking forward to questioning these candidates with respect to their views on the Institute's role, and I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of my statement be included in the record as though presented in full.

Senator STAFFORD. Without objection, that request will be granted.

And, without objection, the Chair will reserve space in the record immediately following my own statement for that of the cochairman of this meeting this morning, Senator Hatfield, as soon as he can get over here from legislation he is offering on the floor of the Senate.

[The prepared statement of Senator Matsunaga follows:]

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR SPARK MATSUNAGA OF HAWAII AT A HEARING ON NOMINEES FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources
Thursday, October 24, 1985

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I greatly appreciate your continued strong support of the United States Institute of Peace and your assistance in arranging prompt hearings on the President's nominees for the Institute's Board of Directors. The importance of these hearings cannot be over stressed, for the success or failure of the Peace Institute will depend upon the caliber, integrity, foresight dedication and basic philosophy of the members of the Board.

Background

Legislation to establish the United States Institute of Peace was passed by the Congress last year and signed into law by President Reagan on October 19, 1984, 201 years after such an agency was first proposed in 1793. Benjamin Bannecker, one of the authors of that first proposal, in an article in Bannecker's Almanac, lamented the lack of any provision for a United States "Peace Office" in the newly-ratified U.S. Constitution. In proposing that such an agency be established, he said:

> It is to be hoped that no objection will be made to the establishment of such an office while we are at war with the Indians, for, as the War-Office of the United States was established in the time of peace, it is equally reasonable that a Peace-Office be established in the time of war."

Since then, for over 200 years, in peace and war, Americans have continued to view world peace as a vital part of our national heritage and as essential to our national security. Proposals for a national agency devoted to peace research and education, which would compliment but not replace the present U.S. Department of Defense and its predecessor agencies, have been advanced throughout our history by men and women of vision and stature both in the public and private sectors, but the U.S. Institute of Peace is based specifically on the findings and recommendations of the Commission on Proposals for the National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution. The nine-member Commission, which I chaired, was established by Congress in 1979 to review the various proposals for a national peace academy, examine a variety of alternatives, and recommend appropriate action to Congress. Three of its members were appointed by the President, three by the Speaker of the House, and three by the President-pro tempore of the Senate. In its report, published in 1981, the Commission recommended the establishment of an independent federal agency which would (1) conduct research of its own and fund research by other organization and institutions, (2) offer graduate and post-graduate education and training and continuing education services for individuals in both the public and private sectors, and (3) establish an information service which would gather and disseminate information relating to peace research, training and education. In pursuit of its purposes and to honor the recently retired 84-year old Senator from West Virginia who was a principal cosponsor of the enabling legislation, the Institute would establish the Jennings Randolph Center for International Peace, to which leaders and potential leaders from this nation and other Nations would be appointed to study the art of peacemaking.

The Commission strongly recommended that the new agency be independent, and Congress endorsed this concept in passing the legislation which established the Institute. It is prohibited form lobbying Congress and participating in the policy making functions of other government departments and agencies. Furthermore, it is prohibited from intervening in any international dispute. Although ex officio members of the Board of Directors include the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the President of the National Defense University, the Institute is not to be a mere extension of the State Department, the Defense Department, the ACDA, or the National Defense University. By insulating the Institute from day-to-day policy making, Congress intended to leave it free to conduct research and inquiry into the causes of war, the prevention of war and new techniques for resolving conflict unfettered by the institutional constraints facing these agencies with their focus on prevailing policy. In fact, proposals to link the Institute more closely with the State Department and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency were specifically rejected, first by the Commission on Proposals for the National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution and then by this Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

The Commission anticipated that the Institute would emphasize the three major branches of peace education, which it reported to be a distinct and identifiable professional field. These are (1) Peace as the absence of war--or the study of non-violent means of resolving international conflict without resort ot war, (2) Peace as social justice--or the study of conditions which are conducive to peace, and (3) the study of new peacemaking techniques. During the Commission's public hearings, many witnesses testified that new peacemaking techniques developed during the last 30 years and utilized by labor and management, civil rights organizations, attorneys and neighborhood dispute resolution clinics might be applied in international relations to enhance and augment official diplomacy, and to assist multinational businesses, religious organizations with missions overseas, and voluntary organizations, such as the International Red Cross. The Commission found that there is substantial public interest here in the United States in the improvement of our peacemaking capability and an eagerness on the part of the average American citizen to be of help in this essential task.

Soon after the Commission's report was published in 1981, I introduced legislation to carry out its recommendations, with Senator Mark Hatfield and then-Senator Jennings Randolph as co-sponsors. In previous years, only Senators Hatfield and Randolph would cosponsor such legislation with me, but, with the publication and distribution of the Commission report with its detailed plan for a national peace agency, I was able to obtain the cosponsorship of 54 Senators. The measure was reintroduced early in the 98th Congress with 55 cosponsors, and to avoid a threatened Presidential veto, that bill, S. 564, was attached as an amendment to the Defense Department Authorization Bill for 1985. It survived the intense scrutiny of a House-Senate Conference Committee with relatively minor changes: the conferees changed the name of the agency to the U.S. Institute of Peace and deleted $7.5 million authorized for lease or purchase of the Institute's Washington headquarters. The Institute was directed to obtain its headquarters space through the General Services Administration.

Delays in Nominating Candidates for the Board of Directors

The amount of support which the new Institute has received in Congress and from the general public has been truly amazing. Since the enactment of the new law, we have been eagerly awaiting President Reagan's nomination of the 11 private sector members of the Institute's Board of Directors. To our great disappointment, the President missed the statutory deadline for submitting his nominations to Congress, which was on April 20, 1985, six months after enactment of the legislation and three months after his inauguration. We were told repeatedly that this was due to lengthy delays in the security clearance process. Frankly I am a bit skeptical about that. The same clearance process is used to evaluate candidates for other major federal posts as well as those nominated for the Board of Directors of the U.S. Institute of Peace. If it does indeed take a full year to clear candidates for federal positions, then the clearance process needs a major overhaul. Conceivably, it could bring the federal government to a complete standstill one of these days.

Candidates Lack of Diversity

It is also disappointing to note that President Reagan did not use his authority to nominate a more diverse slate of candidates. For example, the Board includes no business leaders, no labor leaders, no civil rights leaders, and no professional in the field of conflict resolution. Although the American Association of University Women and the YWCA were among the earliest and staunchest advocates of the U.S. Institute of Peace, no women were nominated to serve on the Institute's Board of Directors.

Finally, the candidates for the Board of Directors were selected from the Northeast/Middle Atlantic region and the West Coast, with no representation from the Mid-West or the South.

The Board's lack of diversity is no trivial matter, for one of its major tasks will be to develop and conduct outreach programs which will include a broad cross section of the American public in the Institute's activities. It will also be establishing policies and procedures for awarding grants and contracts to other organizations and educational institutions interested in developing or strengthening peace research and education programs.

President Reagan has to date nominated only eight of the 11 private sector members of the Board and I do hope that he will try to remedy this flaw when he makes his next 3 and final nominations.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to make an opening statement. I am looking forward to questioning these candidates with respect to their views on the Institute's role.

Thank you very much.

Senator **Stafford**. Again I am going to set precedent here, because wherever you were sitting—in the audience, at the witness table, or up here with us, where I think he should be—I would want Senator Randolph to have an opportunity to say a word, if you care to.

Senator **Randolph**. Mr. Chairman, it was my responsibility and privilege to serve in this room with you on the Committee on Labor and Human Resources for 26 years. Also the same number of years we served together in the committee, down the hall, on Environment and Public Works.

I should not address myself to the subject matter. I feel that would be improper. Because I am here as your guest and the guest of the committee on, I think, very important occasion.

I would like to comment—and this is done with the realization of the contribution over a long period of time of many persons who our good colleague, Sparky, has mentioned today. His, I think factual and, in a sense, certainly very purposeful testimony this morning is further indication of his desire to have this program for hoped-for understanding and peace not just in our own country, but for the peoples of the world.

I think that what we do, let us do in good conscience, not with recrimination in any sense toward the President of the United States, who has problems that we well understand and matters of timing that he perhaps must work out his nominations on even this, as we think, very prime responsibility of leadership, which can and I believe, and hopefully believe, can come from the White House.

Because, Mr. Chairman, it has nothing to do with the hearing in questioning of the witnesses, I would ask your pardon for just this moment to say that I have the undelivered speech of Franklin Roosevelt which he was to have given in St. Louis in April of 1945. I reread it—and I am glad if anyone wishes to have a copy for doing the same as I have been doing, to study the speech, that it would be available.

But it is the closing of the speech that I continue to read and to read and to read. He said if peoples do not learn to live together in understanding and peace—and then he underscores all kinds of people—humankind, he added, will perish in a holocaust of conflict which will leave no one out of its orbit.

Those are approximately the words, but the thought is there, Mr. Chairman.

And I would hope, and I do believe, that those of our guests who are here, who have worked diligently on this subject matter, those that are at this table, those who will sit and make decisions here in this committee, that insofar as possible—and it is possible—that we forget, if we can, at this juncture, the sum of the differences which have existed.

I think what Senator Matsunaga has said should be said. But I am at that point, certainly after a period of 40 years of activity myself in the area of the subject matter, to want to work very diligently to bring our forces together, even though they seem to have been, certainly in many instances, apart during the past few weeks and months. I do remember those final days when I was privileged to be here on the Hill, at the time of the committee action from the standpoint of the joint effort and the inclusion of the Peace Institute.

I am very appreciative personally, Mr. Chairman, for your having asked me to sit here today, and I hope that nothing I've said will be indicated as a part of the record, but only some thoughts that I have had about the challenge that all of you, who will apparently, not only having been nominated but certainly have the approval of the Senate—that you will have the gift of understanding, and the feeling that yes this is in a sense a journey toward possible peace among the peoples of the world.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Senator Randolph. Now we will proceed to ask the nominees to make statements to the committee.

It is my intention, unless the nominees feel differently, to start at the left side with Dr. Moore and then go through you in sequence as you are seated at the table.

I am glad to see that Reverend Neuhaus has arrived. I was given a note a few minutes ago saying you weren't able to be here, so I am glad it was in error and that you are here.

Dr. Moore, before you speak, I do wish to place in the record, without objection, a letter addressed to Orrin Hatch, the chairman of the full committee, in one instance, and a statement to the chairman, which I will assume means me, in another, in support of your nomination, from Senators Trible and Warner.

I will place those in the record.

Gentlemen, I think you have been asked to limit your statements to 5 minutes or less. I will be particularly gratified if you do and can, since I am a product of Calvin Coolidge's part of Vermont and I appreciate brevity, and it will also allow us to finish this hearing without too many interruptions by legislation on the floor of the Senate.

So your full statements will be in the record as if read, and we will start, Dr. Moore, with you.

[The letter to Senator Hatch from Senator Trible and statement of Senator Warner follow:]

PAUL TRIBLE
VIRGINIA

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, DC 20510

October 23, 1985

Hon. Orrin G. Hatch
Chairman, Senator Committee
on Labor and Human Resources
SD - 430
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Orrin:

I want to express my strong support for Mr. John Norton Moore's nomination as Chairman of the Board of Directors for the U.S. Institute of Peace.

Mr. Moore has a long and distinguished record in the areas of foreign affairs, national security, and international law. He has served in numerous governmental positions, and has an impeccable academic background.

He will bring a valuable degree of experience and knowledge to the new Institute for Peace, and I urge the Labor and Human Resources Committee to confirm Mr. Moore as quickly as possible.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Paul Trible

PT:dt

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN WARNER BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1985

MR. CHAIRMAN,

I AM ESPECIALLY PLEASED TO HAVE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO CONVEY MY STRONG SUPPORT FOR THE CONFIRMATION OF JOHN NORTON MOORE OF VIRGINIA AS THE FIRST CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE.

I CAN THINK OF NO CANDIDATE MORE QUALIFIED TO SET THE EXEMPLARY TONE OF LEADERSHIP REQUIRED FOR THIS NEW ORGANIZATION.

JOHN NORTON MOORE PRESENTLY SERVES AS THE JOINT DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER FOR OCEANS LAW AND POLICY AND THE CENTER FOR LAW AND NATIONAL SECURITY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA.

IN ADDITION, HE HAS BEEN DESIGNATED AS A WALTER L. BROWN PROFESSOR OF LAW AND ACTS AS THE DIRECTOR OF THE GRADUATE LAW PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA SCHOOL OF LAW.

THE SCOPE OF HIS EXPERIENCE AND CONTRIBUTION TO SOCIETY HAS NOT, HOWEVER, BEEN LIMITED TO THE WORLD OF ACADEMIA.

(MORE)

Mr. Moore has, in the course of the last decade, provided invaluable assistance to the U.S. government, serving as U.S. Ambassador and Deputy Special Representative of the President to the Law of the Sea Conference, where I was privileged to work with him, and as the Chairman of the National Security Council Interagency Task Force on the Law of the Sea.

He is currently a consultant to the President's Intelligence Oversight Board and a member of the National Advisory Comittee on Oceans and Atmosphere.

The Chairman of the Board of the U.S. Institute of Peace must have the ability to exercise both knowledge and discretion in directing the course of the new program.

The goal is to promote the study of international peace, either through assistance at the graduate level of education or through research conducted in governmental agencies or learning institutions.

I believe that in John Norton Moore we have an ideal candidate to take on this considerable task.

Due to his years of experience in academics and government, I am confident that he will be sensitive to the needs of students and government entities alike.

I urge the members of the committee to join me in my strong support of Mr. Moore and to provide him their expeditous approval.

STATEMENT OF JOHN NORTON MOORE OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA

Professor MOORE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chairman Stafford, Senator Matsunaga, Senator Randolph, it is an honor and a privilege to appear before this committee on this historic occasion for consideration of the first Board of Directors of the new U.S. Institute of Peace. For over 200 years, visionary American statesmen have worked for the creation of such an institute. Most recently, Senator Jennings Randolph, Senator Spark Matsunaga, and the two cochairmen of this hearing, Senators Mark Hatfield and Robert Stafford, as well as Representative Dan Glickman, have been leaders, along with many other thoughtful Americans, in translating this vision into reality.

Today, we are on the threshold of an important opportunity in translating the legal reality of the U.S. Institute of Peace into a dynamic force for understanding peace processes and encouraging peace among nations. As chairman-designate of the first Board of Directors of the Institute of Peace, I am acutely aware of the high responsibility this opportunity entails and of the hopes of millions of Americans toward the new Institute.

There is no problem of mankind more worthy or pressing than the achievement of peace. Each world war has been an order of magnitude more catastrophic than the last, and in an age of thermonuclear weapons, another such conflict simply must not occur. Short of such catastrophic occurrences we must also end the regional and lesser wars that, since World War II, have killed millions and imposed enormous costs on all mankind.

It is altogether fitting that America should lead the world toward a broad-based Institute of Peace. As Senator Matsunaga has written: "The United States has no interest greater than international peace." Americans, reflecting their democratic tradition, have historically taken the lead in working for peace. Americans played a leading role in the Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907. An American Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan, led the world to factfinding and cooling-off treaties as a means of war avoidance.

President Woodrow Wilson dreamed the dream that became the League of Nations. Secretary of State Kellogg led the world to the momentous Pact of Paris that, at least in legal terms, prohibited aggressive war as a modality of foreign policy.

President Franklin Roosevelt led the Allies in the creation of the United Nations. President Truman offered the Baruch plan by which the nuclear genie would have been harnessed exclusively for peaceful purposes. And President Kennedy established the Peace Corps and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, unique national institutions for promoting peace.

The U.S. Institute of Peace is an institution in this great American tradition that, hopefully, will make an important contribution toward the control of violence and achievement of a just peace of freedom and human dignity.

The task of the Board of Directors is clear. It is to implement, with strength and conviction, the mandate contained in the enabling legislation of the U.S. Institute of Peace.

Amoung other roles, the Institute will serve to promote research, education, training, and information exchange in peace processes, conflict management, and war avoidance. As Chairman Stafford has written, the Institute is "designed through education, training, and information dissemination, to improve our response to the resolution of international conflict." And, as Chairman Hatfield has written, the Institute will "serve the American thirst for information on international peace."

In implementing this mandate, a number of important themes are manifest in the legislation and its history. Among others these include:

The Institute and its work are to be nonpartisan: its method should be the pursuit of excellence in an interdisciplinary climate of intellectual freedom.

The Institute is not to be an intervention agency seeking to intervene in the conduct of foreign policy. Rather, its role is that of research, education, training, and information exchange in seeking to enhance our ability to resolve and manage conflict—in the words of the Preamble of the U.N. Charter: ". . . to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

The Institute and its work are not divorced from or opposed to national security but reflect the understanding that enhancing our knowledge and skills in conflict resolution and war avoidance may profoundly contribute to our national security. As Senator Randolph has pointed out, the Institute "represents the recognition of our Federal Government's responsibility to investigate and prepare ourselves for all facets of the maintenance of our national security."

The Institute and its work are not in opposition to programs of the universities and other institutions providing valuable research and education about peace processes, diplomacy and conflict management but rather should serve as a catalyst for encouragement and enhancement of such programs.

The Institute should, in the words of its enabling legislation, pursue its work "through the widest possible range of education and training, basic and applied research opportunities, and peace information services on the means to promote international peace and the resolution of conflicts among the nations and peoples of the world without recourse to violence."

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, it is symbolic that this historic hearing takes place on the 40th anniversary of the United Nations, an organization whose great purposes include, foremost, the maintenance of "international peace and security."

As the new U.S. Institute of Peace begins its work toward this shared goal, the task before the new Board is as great as the age-old wish of all mankind: achieving genuine peace with justice and freedom.

As Chairman-designate, I will do my best to make the work of the Institute worthy of the high hopes entrusted to it by this committee and the American people.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement, biographical sketch, and responses to questions submitted to Professor Moore by Senator Stafford follow:]

Confirmation Hearings for the Board of Directors
# of the United States Institute of Peace

before the
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
of the United States Senate

Testimony of John Norton Moore
Chairman Designate

October 24, 1985

Testimony of John Norton Moore*

Chairmen Hatfield and Stafford and Members of the Committee:

It is an honor and a privilege to appear before this Committee on this historic occasion for consideration of the first Board of Directors of the new United States Institute of Peace. For over 200 years, visionary American statesmen have worked for the creation of such an Institute. Most recently, Senator Jennings Randolph, Senator Spark Matsunaga, and the two co-chairmen of this hearing, Senators Mark Hatfield and Robert Stafford, as well as Representative Dan Glickman, have been leaders, along with many other thoughtful Americans, in translating this vision into reality.

Today, we are on the threshold of an important opportunity in translating the legal reality of the United States Institute of Peace into a dynamic force for understanding peace processes and encouraging peace among nations. As Chairman designate of the first Board of Directors of the Institute of Peace, I am acutely aware of the high responsibility this opportunity entails and of the hopes of millions of Americans toward the new Institute.

There is no problem of mankind more worthy or pressing than the achievement of peace. Each World War has been an order of magnitude more catastrophic than the last and in an age of thermonuclear weapons another such conflict simply must not occur. Short of such catastrophic occurrences we must also end the regional and lesser wars that since World War II have killed millions and imposed enormous costs on all mankind.[1]

It is altogether fitting that America should lead the world toward a broad-based Institute of Peace. As Senator Matsunaga has written: "The United States has no interest greater than international peace."[2] Americans - reflecting their democratic tradition -- have historically taken the lead in working for peace. Americans played a leading role in the Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907. An American Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan, led the world to fact-finding and "cooling-off" treaties as a means of war avoidance. President Woodrow Wilson dreamed the dream that became the League of Nations. Secretary of State Kellogg led the world to the momentous Pact of Paris that, at least in legal terms, prohibited aggressive war as a modality of foreign policy. President Franklin Roosevelt led the allies in the creation of the United Nations. President Truman offered the Baruch Plan by which the nuclear genie would have been harnessed exclusively for peaceful purposes. And President Kennedy established the Peace Corps and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, unique national institutions for promoting peace. The United States Institute of Peace is an institution in this great American tradition that hopefully will make an important contribution toward the control of violence and achievement of a just peace of freedom and human dignity.

The task of the Board of Directors is clear. It is to implement with strength and conviction, the mandate contained in the enabling legislation of the United States Institute of Peace.[3] Among other roles, the Institute will serve to promote research, education, training and information exchange in peace processes, conflict management and war avoidance. As Chairman Stafford has written, the Institute is "designed through education, training, and information dissemination, to improve our response to the resolution of international conflict."[4] And as Chairman Hatfield has written, the Institute will "serve the American thirst for information on international peace."[5]

In implementing this mandate a number of important themes are manifest in the legislation and its history. Among others these include:

- The Institute and its work are to be non-partisan: its method should be the pursuit of excellence in an interdisciplinary climate of intellectual freedom;

- The Institute is not to be an intervention agency seeking to intervene in the conduct of foreign policy. Rather its role is that of research, education, training and information exchange in seeking to enhance our ability to resolve and manage conflict -- in the words of the Preamble of the United Nations Charter -- "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war;"

- The Institute and its work are not divorced from or opposed to national security but reflect the understanding that enhancing our knowledge and skills in conflict resolution and war avoidance may profoundly contribute to our national security. As Senator Randolph has pointed out, the Institute "represents the recognition of our Federal Government's responsibility to investigate and prepare ourselves for all facets of the maintenance of our national security;"[6]

- The Institute and its work are not in opposition to programs of the universities and other institutions providing valuable research and education about peace processes, diplomacy and conflict management but rather should serve as a catalyst for encouragement and enhancement of such programs; and

- The Institute should, in the words of its enabling legislation, pursue its work "through the widest possible range of education and training, basic and applied research opportunities, and peace information services on the means to promote international peace and the resolution of conflicts among the nations and peoples of the world without recourse to violence."

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, it is symbolic that this historic hearing takes place on the 40th anniversary of the United Nations, an organization whose great purposes include, foremost, the maintenance of "international peace and security." As the new United States Institute of Peace begins it work toward this shared goal, the task before the new Board is as great as the age-old wish of all mankind -- achieving genuine peace with justice and freedom. As Chairman-designate, I will do my best to make the work of the Institute worthy of the high hopes entrusted to it by this Committee and the American people.

Thank you.

Footnotes

*Walter L. Brown Professor of Law, the University of Virginia School of Law. Formerly Counselor on International Law to the Department of State, Chairman of the National Security Council Interagency Task Force on the Law of the Sea and Deputy Special Representative of the President to the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea with rank of Ambassador.

[1] Senator Spark Matsunaga pointed out during Senate consideration of enabling legislation: "(t)he tragic fact is that some 300 such wars, yes 300 such wars, have been fought since the end of World War II." 130 Cong. Record S7802 (No. 85 June 20, 1984).

[2] Preface by Commission Chairman Spark Matsunaga in "To Establish the United States Academy of Peace" (Report of the Committee on Proposals for the National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution to the President of the United States and the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress 1981), at xi.

[3] P.L. 98-525, October 19, 1984.

[4] 130 Cong. Record, supra note 1, at S7803.

[5] Senator Mark O. Hatfield in C. Smith (ed.), The 100% Challenge (1985), at x.

[6] 130 Cong. Record, supra note 1, at S7792.

STATEMENT FOR COMPLETION BY PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES

PART I: ALL THE INFORMATION IN THIS PART WILL BE MADE PUBLIC

Name: Moore (Last) John (First) Norton (Middle)

Position to which nominated: Member and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the U.S. Institute of Peace

Date of nomination: Member, 8/1/85 Chairman 10/3/85

Date of birth: 12 (day) 6 (month) 37 (year)

Place of birth: New York, New York

Marital status: Married

Full name of spouse: Barbara Schneider Moore

Name and ages of children: Victoria Norton Moore (10 months)

Education:

Institution	Dates attended	Degrees received	Dates of degrees
See Attachment 1			

Honors and awards: List below all scholarships, fellowships, honorary degrees, military medals, honorary society memberships, and any other special recognitions for outstanding service or achievement.

See Attachment 2

Memberships: List below all memberships and offices held in professional, fraternal, business, scholarly, civic, charitable and other organizations for the last five years and any other prior memberships or offices you consider relevant.

Organization	Office held (if any)	Dates
See Attachment 3		

Employment record: List below all positions held since college, including the title or description of job, name of employer, location of work, and dates of inclusive employment.

See Attachment 4

Government experience:

List any advisory, consultative, honorary or other part-time service or positions with Federal, State, or local governments other than those listed above.

See Attachment 5

Published writings:

List the titles, publishers and dates of books, articles, reports or other published materials you have written.

See Attachment 6

Political affiliations and activities:

List all memberships and offices held in or financial contributions and services rendered to all political parties or election committees during the last five years.

See Attachment 7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Future employment relationships:

1. Indicate whether you will sever all connections with your present employer, business firm, association or organization if you are confirmed by the Senate.

See Attachment 8

2. State whether you have any plans after completing government service to resume employment, affiliation or practice with your previous employer, business firm, association or organization.

Yes. See answer to question 1 above, Attachment 8.

3. Has a commitment been made to you for employment after you leave Federal service?

N/A. See answer to question 1 above, Attachment 8.

4. Do you intend to serve the full term for which you have been appointed or until the next Presidential election, whichever is applicable?

Yes, that is my present intention.

Potential conflicts of interest:

1. Describe any financial arrangements, deferred compensation agreements or other continuing financial, business or professional dealings with business associates, clients or customers who will be affected by policies which you will influence in the position to which you have been nominated.

See Attachment 9.

2. List any investments, obligations, liabilities, or other financial relationships which constitute potential conflicts of interest with the position to which you have been nominated.

None that contribute potential conflicts of interest to my knowledge.

3. Describe any business relationship, dealing or financial transaction which you have had during the last five years whether for yourself, on behalf of a client, or acting as an agent, that constitutes a potential conflict of interest with the position to which you have been nominated.

None to my knowledge.

4. List any lobbying activity during the past 10 years in which you have engaged for the purpose of directly or indirectly influencing the passage, defeat or modification of any Federal legislation or of affecting the administration and execution of Federal law or policy.

Testimony on behalf of the American Bar Association positions before the United States Congress on legislation concerning intelligence, genocide, and other matters.

5. Explain how you will resolve any potential conflict of interest that may be disclosed by your responses to the above items.

Any real conflict of interest with my ongoing employment is remote. I would, of course, excuse myself from decisions concerning grants to any institutions with which I am currently employed.

John Norton Moore

SUMMARY

- Director, Centers for Oceans law and Policy and Law and National Security; Walter L. Brown Professor of Law, The University of Virginia.
- Chairman, NSC Interagency Task Force on the Law of the Sea; and U.S. Ambassador and Deputy Special Representative of the President to the Law of the Sea Conference (1973-76).
- Counselor on International Law to the Department of State (1972-73).
- Chairman, American Bar Association Standing Committee on Law and National Security (1982-present).
- Consultant, President's Intelligence Oversight Board (1982-present).
- Member, National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere (1984-present).
- Member, U.S. Delegation to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Athens 1984).
- Member, Presidential Delegation of the United States to observe the elections in El Salvador (1984).
- Special Counsel for the United States in the Gulf of Maine and Nicaragua cases before the International Court of Justice (1981-84).
- Chairman, Advisory Committee on Oceans Policy, Republican National Committee.

EDUCATION

BA (Economics), Drew University, 1959.

LLB, Duke Law School (with distinction), 1962.

Fellow, University of California International Legal Studies Program, 1963.

LLM, University of Illinois, 1965.

Fellow, Yale Law School, 1965-66.

EMPLOYMENT

Director, Center for Oceans Law and Policy and Center for Law and National Security; Walter L. Brown Professor of Law; Director, Graduate Law Program, University of Virginia School of Law (1965-72; 1976-present.)

> Academic duties include teaching courses and seminars on Law and National Security, International Law, Oceans Law and Policy, The Constitution and Foreign Relations Powers, and Contemporary Legal Thought (jurisprudence). In addition, adjunct Professor of Law at Georgetown Law Center (teaching law and national Security and Oceans Law and Policy); adjunct Professor of Law at American University (teaching Law and National Security); and consultant and lecturer at the National War College, the Naval War College, the Army War College, the Foreign Service Institute and the Judge Advocate General's School of the Army. Also lectures widely on national security issues, United States maritime policy, and resource and energy issues. Frequent witness before Congressional committees on maritime policy, legal aspects of foreign policy decisions, national security, war powers, treaty powers, and other issues concerning Legislative-Executive relations in the conduct of foregin affairs.

Special Counsel to the U.S. in the Gulf of Maine Case before the International Court of Justice (1981-84).
Special Counsel to the U.S. in the Nicaragua Case before the International Court of Justice (1984).

Consultant, President's Intelligence Oversight Board (1982-present).

Fellow, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (1976).

Chairman, National Security Council Interagency Task Force on the Law of the Sea; and Deputy Special Representative of the President for the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, with rank of Ambassador (1973-76).

Employment (continued)

Duties involved extensive negotiation with United States allies, the Soviet Union, and developing countries; coordination with the Congress and the private sector; and shaping and implementing a unified Executive Branch position on oceans issues.

Counselor on International Law to the Department of State (1972-73).

Among other duties:

- drafted U.S. sponsored treaty to prevent the spread of terrorism;
- worked extensively on constitutional issues concerning Legislative-Executive relations in the conduct of foreign affairs, including the War Powers Resolution and the Case Amendment (on international agreements);
- chaired 75-member U.S. Delegation to the United Nations Seabed Committee (March-April 1973);
- supervised preparation and Congressional introduction of joint State-Justice Department sovereign immunity bill.

Member, U.S. Delegation to the United Nations General Assembly (1972-75).

Arbitrator, *International Bank v. Overseas Private Investment Corporation* (1972).

Sesquicentennial Associate, Center for Advanced Studies, University of Virginia (1971-72).

PUBLICATIONS

Books: *Law and the Indo-China War,* (Princeton University Press, 1972).

The Arab-Israeli Conflict, (Princeton University Press, 3 vols., 1974 ed. One volume revised and abridged edition, 1977).

Law and Civil War in the Modern World, (Johns Hopkins Press, 1974 ed.).

Readings in International Law from the Naval War College Review, (2 vols., 1983 eds with Richard B. Lillich).

Law and the Grenada Mission (1984).

Articles: Articles have appeared in Foreign Affairs, the American Journal of International Law, the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, the Los Angeles Times, Marine Technology Society Journal, Yale Law Journal, Virginia Law Review, Virginia Journal of International Law, and numerous other publications.

PROFESSIONAL HONORS AND ASSOCIATIONS

Consultant, The Presidents' Intelligence Oversight Board (1982-present).

Member, Order of the Coif and Phi Beta Kappa; Articles Editor, *the Duke Law Journal;* Recipient of Phi Beta Kappa award for *Law and the Indo-China War;* Drew University College Alumni Achievement Award in the Arts 1976; Fellow of the Marine Technology Society 1983; Hardy Dillard Award in International Law of The Virginia Bar Association 1984; Myres McDougal lecture in International Law, the University of Denver; Brandon Brown lecture, Catholic University; Waldemar Solf Lecture in International Law, the Judge Advocate General's School of the Army, 1984; George Washington Honor Medal of The Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge, 1985.

Member of the Bars of Florida (1962), Illinois (1963), Virginia (1969), District of Columbia (1974), United States Supreme Court (1973), United States Court of Claims (1980), and other courts.

Member of the Board of Editors, American Journal of International Law, Marine Technology Society Journal, and Journal of Political Communication and Persuasion. Chairman of the American Bar Association Standing Committee on Law and National Security (1983-present). Vice Chairman of the Section of International Law of the American Bar Association (1980-83). Member, State Department Advisory Committee on Law of the Sea (1976-82). Consultant, Department of State (1981-present). Member of the International Research Council of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Consortium for the Study of Intelligence, Council on Foreign Relations, Board of Directors of the American Oceanic Organization, American Branch of the International Law association, American Law Institute, and International Studies Advisory Board, the Hoover Institution, Legislative Task Group of the World Strategy Network, Board of Directors of the National Strategy Information Center, and Council of the Marine Technology Society. President, Conflict Analysis Center (1983-present).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Biographical profiles appear in Who's Who in the World, Who's Who in America, Who's Who in Government, and Who's Who in American Law.

REFERENCES

Available upon request.

PERSONAL

Born: June 12, 1937, New York, New York

Married: The former Barbara Schneider, December 12, 1981, Christ Church, Alexandria, Virginia

Children: Victoria Norton Moore, born November 26, 1984.

Religion: Episcopal

Club Memberships: Cosmos Club (Washington, D.C.), and New York Yacht Club

Office Addresses:

University of Virginia School of Law
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901

Telephone (804) 924-7441

Oceans and International
Apt. 3-1618
307 Yoakum Parkway
Alexandria, Virginia 22304

Telephone: (703) 751-7798

Home Addresses:

824 Flordon Drive
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901

Telephone: (804) 977-2749

802 Pendleton Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 548-3029

Attachment 1

Education:

Institution	Dates attended	Degrees received	Dates of degrees
Drew University	1955-59	AB Econ.	1959
Duke Law School	1959-62	LLB with dist.	1962
Univ. of Ill. School of Law	1962-3	LLM	1965
U. of Calif. Berk.	Sum. 1963	Program in Regional Intl. Org.	—
Yale Law School	1965-66	Fellow NIH	—

Attachment 2

Honors and awards:

Member, Order of the Coif and Phi Beta Kappa; Articles Editor, The Duke Law Journal; Recipient of Phi Beta Kappa award for Law and the Indo-China War; Drew University College Alumni Achievement Award in the Arts 1976; Fellow of the Marine Technology Society 1983; Hardy Dillard Award in International Law of The Virginia Bar Association 1984; Myres McDougal lecture in International Law, the University of Denver; Brendon Brown lecture, Catholic University; Waldemar Solf Lecture in International Law, the Judge Advocate General's School of the Army, 1984; George Washington Honor Medal of The Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge, 1985; Fellowship, Duke Law School; The University of Illinois; The University of California Summer Program in Regional International Organizations; Special Fellow of the National Institute of Health at Yale Law School; Sesquicentennial Fellow at the University of Virginia; Fellowships for Research and Scholarship at the University of Virginia; Fellowship from the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

Attachment 3

Memberships:

Organization	Office Held	Dates
Board of Editors, The American Journal of Int'l. Law	Member of Board of Editors	Approx. since 1972
Board of Editors, The Marine Technology Society Journal	Member of Board of Editors	Approx. since 1982
Board of Editors, The Journal of Political Communication and Persuasion	Member of Board of Editors	Approx. since 1984
American Bar Association Standing Committee on Law and National Security	Chairman	Approx. since 1978 as Member and 1983 as Chairman
American Bar Association Section of International Law	Member & Formerly Vice-Chairman	Approx. since late 1960's as member & Vice-Chairman in early 1980's to approx. 1984
National Advisory Committee on Oceans & Atmosphere (NACOA)	Member	Approx. since 1984
State Department Advisory Committee on Law of the Sea	Member	Approx. for 1976 until duration of Committee approx. in 1981
State Department Advisory Committee on International Law	Member	Approx. 1970-72
Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies	Member International Research Council	Approx. since 1982
Consortium for the Study of Intelligence	Member	Approx. since 1978
Council on Foreign Relations	Member	Approx. since 1975
American Oceanic Organization	Member & Board of Directors	Approx. since 1975 & Board approx. 1977-1982
American Branch, International Law Association	Member	Approx. since late 1960's

Attachment 3 - Continued

Organization Memberships	Office Held	Dates
American Society of International Law	Member & Formerly Member of Executive Council & Board of Review & Development & Chairman & Member of Nominating Committee, Committee on the Annual Meeting and Other Committees	Approx. since 1962 in various positions
American Law Institute	Member	Approx. since 1982
American Bar Association	Member	Approx. since 1962
The Hoover Institution	International Studies Advisory Board	Approx. since 1984
World Strategy Network	Legislative Task Group	Approx. since 1982
National Strategy Information Center	Board of Directors	Approx. since 1980
Marine Technology Society	Council and Member	Approx. since 1975
Conflict Analysis Center	President	Approx. since 1983
Oceans & International (consulting firm largely work for Department of State and Sandia National Laboratories)	President	Approx. since 1976
President's Intelligence Oversight Board	Consultant	Approx. since 1982
The Navy League	Member	Approx. since 1978
Denver Journal of International Law	Faculty, Board of Editors	Approx. since 1978
Virginia Journal of International Law	Faculty, Board of Editors	Approx. since 1978
Smithsonian Institution	Associate	Approx. since 1972 (not continuous)
Cosmos Club	Member	Approx. since 1968

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Attachment 3 - Continued

Organization Memberships:	Office Held	Dates
New York Yacht Club	Member	Approx. since 1978
The Florida Bar	Member	Since 1962
The Illinois Bar	Member	Since 1963
The Virginia Bar	Member	Since 1969
The District of Columbia Bar	Member	Since 1974
United States Supreme Court Bar	Member	Since 1973
United States Court of Claims Bar and Other Courts	Member	Since 1980
The Methodist Church	Member	Approx. 1945-1984
The Episcopal Church	Member	Since Approx. 1984

Attachment 4

Employment Record:

1966-present: Walter L. Brown Professor of Law, Director, the Center for Law and National Security, the Center for Oceans Law & Policy and the Graduate Program, the University of Virginia Law School, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Approx. March-April, 1984: Department of State (Office of the Legal Adviser), Washington, D.C., Athens, The Hague. (On leave as Special Counsel for Gulf of Maine Case before the International Court of Justice and U.S. delegation to the Athens meeting of the CSCE talks.)

1976-1976: Fellow, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C., left position to rejoin University of Virginia faculty.

1976-1973: U.S. Ambassador to LOS Conference and Deputy Special Representative of the President for LOS Conference. Chairman of the NSC Task Force on Law of the Sea. Left position for Woodrow Wilson Center and return to University of Virginia.

1972-1973: DOS, Office of the Legal Adviser, Washington, D.C., Counselor on International Law. Left position when appointed to head NSC Task Force on LOS.

1965-1966: Yale Law School, New Haven, CT., NIH Fellow, left to join University of Virginia faculty.

1963-1965: University of Florida, School of Law, Gainesville, Florida, Associate Professor of Law, Assistant Dean, formerly Assistant Professor, left position for Yale Law School.

1962-1963: University of Illinois School of Law, Champaign/Urbana, Illinois, Teaching Assistant, left for full-time position on University of Florida Faculty of Law.

Note: Summer and part-time employment in college and law school have been omitted.

Attachment 5

Government experience: (in addition to the full-time positions listed above)

Member, National Advisory Committee on Oceans & Atmosphere, since approx. 1984.

Consultant, President's Intelligence Oversight Board, since approx. 1982.

Member, State Department Advisory Committee on Law of the Sea, approx. from 1976 until dissolution of committee in 1981.

Member, State Department Advisory Committee on International Law, approx. 1970-72.

Consultant, Department of State, approx. 1976 to present on various issues including the Gulf of Maine and Nicaragua cases before the World Court.

Consultant, Sandia National Laboratories, approx. 1982 to present on various ocean pollution issues.

Member, President's Delegation to Observe the Elections in El Salvador, 1984.

Member, U.S. Delegation to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Athens, 1984).

Special Counsel for the United States in The Gulf of Maine and Nicaragua cases before the International Court of Justice, 1981-85.

Attachment 6

Published Writings:

Books:

Title	Publisher	Date of Publication
Law and the Indo-China War	Princeton University Press	1972
I-III The Arab-Israeli Conflict (Ed.)	Princeton University Press	1974 (and one volume abridged edition, 1977)
Law and Civil War in the Modern World (Ed.)	Johns Hopkins Press	1974
Readings in International Law from the Naval War College Review (Ed. with Lillich)	Naval War College	1983
Law and the Grenada Mission	Center for Law & National Security & the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies	1984

Book Reviews

1. "Prolegomenon to the Jurispurdence of McDougal and Lasswell," 54 *Virginia Law Review* 583 (1968).
2. "The Elephant Misperceived: Intervention and American Foreign Policy," 56 *Virginia Law Review* 364 (1970).

Articles

1. Note: "Constitutional Law: 'Under color of' Law and the Civil Rights Act," 1961, *Duke Law Journal* 452 (1961).
2. "Role of the State Department in Judicial Proceedings," 31 *Fordham Law Review* 277 (1962).
3. "The Supreme Court and the Relationship Between the "Establishment" and "Free Exercise" Clauses," 42 *Texas Law Review* 142 (1963).
4. "International Law and the United States' Role in Vietnam: A Reply," 76 *Yale Law Journal* 1051 (1967).
5. "Lawfulness of U.S. Assistance to the Republic of Vietnam," 5 *Duquesne Law Review* 235 (1967).

Attachment 6 - Continued

6. "A Response to Professor Friedman," 61 American Journal of International Law 776 (1967).

7. "Federalism and Foreign Relations," Duke Law Journal 248 (1968).

8. "Role of Law in the Vietnam Debate," 41 Connecticut Bar Journal 389 (1968).

9. "Control of Foreign Intervention in Internal Conflict," 9 Virginia Journal of International Law 205 (1969).

10. "Justiciability of Challenges to the Use of Military Forces Abroad," 10 Virginia Journal International Law 85 (1969).

11. "Commentary in the Symposium: Constitution and the Use of Military Force Abroad," Virginia Journal of Intrnational Law 32 (1969).

12. "Legal Dimensions of the Decision to Intercede in Cambodia," 65 American Journal of International Law 1 (1971).

13. "Ratification of the Geneva Protocol on Gas and Bacteriological Warfare: A Legal and Political Analysis," 58 Virginia Law Review 419 (1972).

14. "Law and National Security," 51 Foreign Affairs 408 (1973).

15. "Contemporary Issues in the Ongoing Debate: The Roles of Congress and the President in Foreign Affairs," 7 International Lawyer 733 (1973).

16. "Towards the Definition of International Terrorism," 67 American Society of International Law Proceedings 87 (1973).

17. "The Law of the Sea: A Choice and A Challenge," 15 Virginia International Law Journal 791 (1975).

18. "Rescuing UNCLOS III from the Rocks of the Deep Seabed," 17 Virginia Journal of International Law 1 (1976).

19. "Foreign Policy and Fidelity to Law: The Anatomy of A Treaty Violation," 70 American Journal of International Law 802 (1976).

20. "Organizing for A National Oceans Program," from the Symposium New Directions in United States Ocean Policy, 17 William and Mary Law Review 1 (1977).

21. "The Human Interest in the Oceans," 2 Theosaurus Aercabam 10 (1977).

22. "U.S. Policy and the Arab Boycott," Proceedings of the 71st ASIL meeting, April 21-23, 1977, p. 174.

23. "In Search of Common Nodules at UNCLOS III 18 Virginia Journal of International Law 1 (1977).

Attachment 6 - Continued

24. "Next Steps Toward A Law of the Sea in the Common Interest, 14 San Diego Law Review 523 (1977).

25. "A Foreign Policy for the Oceans," 1 Ocean Policy Studies 1 (April 1978).

26. "Law and Foreign Policy of the Oceans," 9 California Western International Law Journal 401 (1979).

27. "Some Specific Suggestions for Resolving Two Lingering Law of the Sea Problems: Packages of Amendments on 'The Status of the Economic Zone' and Marine Scientific Research," 19 Virginia Journal of International Law 401 (1979).

28. "Foreign Policy of the Oceans" 9 California Western International Law Journal 445 (1979).

29. Panel Discussion Participation on China and the Constitutional Implications of Recognition and Derecognition, 73 Am. Soc. Int'l L. Proc. 137 (1979).

30. "Ocean and Coastal Management Division," 14 Marine Technology Society Journal 34 (1980).

31. "Regime of Straits and the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea 74 American Journal of International Law 77 (1980).

32. "Foreign Policy Dimensions of the Crisis in Oil," 17 Willamette Law Review III (1980).

33. "Charting A New Course in the Law of the Sea Negotiations," 10 Denver Journal of International Law and Policy 207 (1981).

34. "International Economic Policy and National Security," (from Symposium on the Economic Aspects of National Security and Foreign Policy) 1 Public Law Forum 29 (1981).

35. "Lessons for the Future," Freedom at Issue, November-December 1981, p. 6.

36. Remarks on Preserving Order and Security, 75 Am. Society Int'l L. Proc. 55 (1981).

37. "Oral Remarks on the Falklands War," 1982 ASIL Proceedings, Panel 17: The Falklands/Mulvinas.

38. "Interstate Armed Conflict and Wars of National Liberation," 31 Am. U. L. Rev. 805 (1982).

39. "Legal Standards for Intervention in Internal Conflicts," 13 Ga. J. Int'l & Comp. L. 191 (1983).

40. "Nuclear Weapons and the Law: Enhancing Strategic Stability," 9 Brookly J.

Attachment 6 - Continued

Int'l L. 263 (1983).

41. "Grenada and the International Double Standard,' 78 Am. J. Int'l L. 145 (1984).

42. "The Basic Myths of Terrorism," Congress Monthly January/February 1984 p. 17.

43. "Legal Issues in the Central American Conflict," Journal of Contemporary Studies, Winter/Spring 1985.

44. "Tripping Through Wonderland with Noam Chomsky: A Response," 8 Journal of Contemporary Studies 47 (1985).

Newspaper Articles:

1. "Premature Action Would Ruin a High-Stakes Game," Los Angeles Times, Part VI, p. 5, November 2, 1975.

2. "To Protect U.S. Oceans Interests," New York Times, October 21, 1976, editorial.

3. "How Not to Protect our Oceans," Newsday, July 10, 1978, p. 41.

4. "The Sea Law Treaty Should be Drydocked," Newsday, June 8, 1981, p. 39.

5. "The Legal Basis for Grenada," The Washington Times, section C, p. 1 (November 11, 1983).

6. "Rethinking the 'War Powers Gambit,' Wall Street Journal, p. 35 (1983).

7. "Nicaraguan Injustice at the World Court," Wall Street Journal, October 8, 1984.

8. "Cuba, Nicaragua Are the Real Dangers," Los Angeles Times, (April 22, 1985).

Testimony

- Statement before the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on the NOAA Organic Act of 1977 (April 17, 1978).

- Statement before the Democratic National Committee Platform Hearings on U.S. Oceans Policy (May 29, 1980).

- Statement before the Republican National Committee Platform Hearings on U.S. Oceans Policy (January 14, 1980).

- Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Legal Dimensions of the Air Attack by Israel Against the Osirak Nuclear Reactor (June 25, 1981).

Attachment 6 - Continued

- Statement before the Select Committee on Intelligence on S.1324 (amendment to the National Security Act) (June 28, 1983).
- Statement to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and the Ocean Floor Beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction, (August 13, 1973).
- Statement before the Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs of the House Committee on International Relations on "Executive Agreements," (July 22, 1976).
- Statement before the Subcommittee on Separation of Powers of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on Executive Agreements and Congressional-Executive Relations (April 25, 1972).
- Paper on the Legal Issues in the Central American Conflict delivered at the White House before the Central American Out-Reach Working Camp, (October 31, 1984).
- Statement on S.1988, the "Emergency Marine Fisheries Protection Act of 1974" before the Interagency Task Force for the Law of the Sea Conference, (October 8, 1974).
- Statement of S.1134, the Deep Seabed Hard Mineral Resources Act," before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuels, (June 14, 1973).
- Statement on the Authority to Terminate International Agreements before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations concerning the Authority to Terminate International Agreements, April 11, 1979.
- Statement in Support of Ratification of the International Human Rights Treaties before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, (January 19, 1978).
- Statement on the Proposed Panama Canal Treaties before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, (January 19, 1978).
- Statement on U.S. Ocean Interests and the Third U.N. Conference on the Law of the Sea before the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee (August 17, 1978).
- Statement on S.961, The Extension of Fisheries Jurisdiction to 200 Miles before the Senate Subcommittee on Oceans and International Environment, (October 31, 1975).

Note: Professor Moore has written widely. This is a diligent effort to identify all of the writings of Professor Moore, but it is not possible to be certain that all published materials written over a 24-year period have been found. Similarly, while in the Government, Professor Moore testified and lectured widely in an official representative capacity and this list almost certainly does not contain all such statements.

Attachment 7

Political Affiliations and Activities:

Member, Republican Party.

Chairman, Advisory Committee on Oceans Policy, Republican National Committee.

Participation in Reagan-Bush Campaign: drafting of memo on international organization policy, 1980.

Contributions to National Republican Party organizations or election committees: (including Presidential Fund, RNC & GOP Victory Fund, Rep. Presidential Trust, RNC Task Force, Membership Fee and RNC 1980 fund)

	Year	Amount
	1985	(est. $15 to $60)
	1984	(est. $55.00)
	1983	(est. $65.00)
	1982	(est. $25.00)
	1981	(est. $35.00)
	1980	(est. $60.00)
Reagan Bush 1984 Campaign	1984	(est. $20.00)
	1983	(est. $10.00)
Contribution to election committee of Elliot Richardson	1984	(est. $185.00)
Reagan Bush Campaign	1980	(est. $50.00)
Republican Presidential Fund Virginia	1980	(est. $15.00)

Attachment 8

Future Relationships:

1. No. Service on the Board of Directors is a part-time position. I expect to continue all present employment and activities. I have, however, submitted my resignation to the President as a member of the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere (NACOA) in view of my nomination as Chairman of the U.S. Institute of Peace.

Attachment 9

Potential conflicts of interest: (all remote)

1. The University of Virginia, Walter L. Brown Professor of Law and Director of the Graduate Program and Director of the Center for Oceans Law and Policy and Law and National Security.

   Georgetown Law Center, Adjunct faculty.

   American University School of Law, Adjunct faculty.

   Department of State, Sandia and other Government agencies, Consultant periodically.

Answers to Questions for Candidates For The Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace

John Norton Moore, Chairman-Designate

1. **Have you received any instructions from the White House, the State Department, the Defense Department or the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency concerning reauthorization of the Institute? Are you familiar with the Administration-proposed amendments to the Institute and if so, what is your position?**

1. I have not received any instructions concerning reauthorization of the Institute. My conversations with a representative of the Office of Management and Budget, however, have implied support for reauthorization by making it clear that OMB is expecting a recommendation from the Board as to its fiscal 1987 budget. As indicated in my testimony I believe the task of the Board is to implement, with strength and conviction, the mandate contained in the enabling legislation. That certainly includes a committment to reauthorization before such authorization expires -- indeed, it includes a committment to a process of continuing reauthorization. The Institute, of course, as an independent body will not take "instructions" from any source but rather is bound to implement its enabling legislation. Certainly it should consult widely -- including consulting with the Executive Branch -- as it implements its mandate.

In general terms I am familiar with the Administration-proposed amendments to the Institute. I support the enabling legislation of the United States Institute of Peace as enacted into law. The Board, I believe, should not take a position on proposed amendments, now or in the future, without careful consultation with its principal Congressional Oversight Committees, as well as the Executive Branch.

2. **The U.S. Institute of Peace Act authorizes the Institute to carry out a number of activities including research of its own, the funding of research at other institutions, education and training at the graduate and post-graduate levels, continuing education, information services, and the Jennings Randolph Center for International Peace. Which of these activities do you think should receive priority during the next six months? During the next year?**

2. Pursuant to the committment to implement, with strength and conviction, the mandate contained in the enabling legislation, all of these and other functions embodied in the legislation should receive priority attention. The pass through requirements of the legislation, however, as well as the need for initial establishment and organization of the Institute, suggest that one priority of the start-up period should be funding of research and programs at existing institutions to enable them to strengthen and expand their work. An effort to obtain a broad overview of existing, ongoing and planned conflict management research work would also seem one possible early priority.

3. **What sort of symposia and training programs will you initiate, and for whom, and to what purpose?**

4. **Do you have any ideas on how you might use grants to fund peace education?**

3.&4. One of the priorities of the Board should be, I believe, to conduct careful hearings with those closely involved in the work to create the Institute, with other recognized experts in the area of peace and conflict studies and with interested members of the public to generate ideas and proposals for useful symposia, training programs and educational grants. One intellectual focus that is strongly reflected in the history of the enabling legislation is the interdisciplinary work taking place in conflict resolution. That would be one area that should be carefully examined for early opportunities for symposia, training programs and grants.

5. **What involvement, if any, have you had with the United States Institute of Peace prior to your nomination for its Board—during the long legislative history, and through your publications or speeches?**

5. I have consistently supported and worked for creation of the United States Institute of Peace. Specific activities in support of the Institute include: work within the American Bar Association in support of the Institute; assistance to the publishing effort for "The One Hundred Percent Callenge," a book dedicated to the Institute and its work; serving as Moderator of a forum on Capitol Hill to discuss the new Institute; and participation in a community group in Charlottesville, Virginia working for University involvement with the Institute. I have also supported the Institute in public statements and speeches.

6. **What will you do to ensure that the Institute's independence, reputation, or credibility is not compromised by covert intelligence action, any misuse of the**

Institute's potential access to classified materials or association with the various intelligence agencies?

6. Ensuring the independence, reputation and credibility of the Institute -- as mandated by the enabling legislation -- will be an important responsibility of the Board. Part of such responsibility is to ensure no misuse of the Institute's potential access to classified information or compromise resulting from its legislative relations with the intelligence community. These are critical responsibilities cutting to the heart of the Institute's long-term effectiveness and ability to achieve its mandate. As such, these issues might be one subject for the Board to address in an early development of by-laws and policy. The Board and the Institute, of course, receive the protection of the existing network of laws regulating classified material and conduct of intelligence activities, as well as the strong mandate of the Institute's own enabling legislation with respect to its independence.

7. **This Committee has emphasized that the Institute is not to make U.S. foreign policy or to implement it. What will you do to ensure that it does not perform a policy making or implementation role?**

7. It will be an important continuing responsibility of the Board to ensure that its actions comply in every respect with its enabling legislation, including the clear statutory and legislative history mandate that the Institute not serve as an intervention agency. The making and implementation of the foreign policy of the United States is for the United States Executive Branch and Congress. The presence of four top level governmental members on the Board of the Institute

is an important innovation of its founders to ensure that the work of the Institute is in touch with important issues yet does not encroach on the making and implementation of foreign policy as prohibited by the Institute's legislative mandate.

8. **It has been this Committee's intent that the Institute develop its own programs, courses, publications and public educational activities, that the Institute provide grants to existing institutions to strengthen and expand their programs, and that the institute establish a series of satellite branches across the nation. What is your intention to develop the Institute along these lines?**

8. I support all of these functions, as developed in the enabling legislation of the United States Institute of Peace and its background legislative history. The Institute should, I believe, be developed to fully implement its important legislative mandate.

9. **What will you do to ensure that the public may fully participate in the Institute's programs, rather than creating or catering to an elite of specialists?**

9. The Institute is charged by law with public educational programs as well as support of specialized research and other functions. It should seek in its programs to ensure an appropriate balance in public and more specialized programs. Similarly, one of the important functions of the Institute is to make available expert and scholarly findings about management of conflict to participants in the foreign policy process and the public.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Senator **Stafford**. Thank you very much, Mr. Moore, for that very good statement—and the brevity with which it was delivered.

I should say that the chairman is keeping track of the time.

We are very happy now to welcome my cochairman here. He and I have both managed to get some legislation adopted this morning in the Senate before we got here—and I guess yours took a little longer than we had hoped, Senator Hatfield.

As a personal footnote, I am going to point out that Senator Hatfield and I and Senator Fritz Hollings of South Carolina are three surviving members of the Governors Council of 1959-60 who somehow ended up together here in the U.S. Senate with some others who have come and left for greener pastures.

Senator Hatfield, I reserved space for your statement immediately with my own at the beginning of this hearing. If you would care to deliver it, this would be a good time.

We have just heard the statement of Mr. Moore, the Chairman-designate, and we are about to go, if this is agreeable to you, to Dr. Thompson. I have already said that we would follow in the order in which they are seated.

So, Dr. Thompson, we will stick with that, and we will go with you.

STATEMENT OF SCOTT THOMPSON OF AMISSVILLE, VA

Dr. **Thompson**. Thank you, Senator Stafford, Senator Hatfield, Senator Matsunaga, Senator Randolph.

I am honored to be here before this committee for the first time. Having spent the 20 years of my professional career in academia and Government in the fields of international relations, arms control and foreign policy, at the intersection of which is the area of peace research, I am deeply committed to the work for which this Institute was formed.

With respect to these commitments, let me just briefly say that, first of all, we must sponsor work of the highest professional quality.

Second, innovation—to search for new ways both at the technical and substantive levels that the cause of peace can be fostered in international politics.

Third, the Institute of Peace must become a symbol of the commitment of all Americans toward a peaceful world, a vital center of serious scholarship, a lively focus of discussion in the field, bringing together those working arms control and world political questions from the diplomatic or national defense end.

I believe that the Board here can and should pledge to make the new Institute an important component of America's and everybody's quest for a more peaceful world.

Let me say personally that back, 25 years ago, as an undergraduate, when I founded a model United Nations at Stanford, or as a delegate to the second United Nations Special Session on Disarmament, as a member of numerous conflict-resolution groups at Georgetown University, of the United Nations Association, or as Associate Director of the United States Information Agency, where my first job or my first assignment was to have constructed a series of pamphlets and displays on America's long search for peace, and as, for 18 years, a faculty member of the oldest graduate school of foreign affairs in this country, I feel professionally and totally committed to the work for which this Institute was founded.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Thompson, his biographical sketch, and responses to questions submitted to him follows:]

Statement of W. Scott Thompson

24 October 1985

Committee on Labor and Human Resources

I am honored to appear before this committee for the first time, as well as to be nominated by President Reagan to the board of directors of the United States Institute of Peace. Having spent the twenty years of my professional career in academia and government in the fields of international relations, arms control and foreign policy, at the intersection of which is the area of peace research, I am deeply committed to the work for which the Institute was formed.

Professional Qualifications. As an undergraduate at Stanford University and president of the Institute for International Relations there I organized its first model United Nations. I subsequently have been a delegate to the second United Nations Special Session on Disarmament, and have been a member of numerous working groups and conferences on arms control issues, at the Georgetown University Center for Strategic and International Studies, for the United Nations Association, and so forth. My writings have ranged from studies of how best to use multilateral channels for arms control to studies of how the strategic balance affects the prospects for arms control. For eighteen years, subsequent to acquiring a doctorate at Oxford University, I have been a faculty member of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University.

The Work of the Institute. The first commitment of the United States Institute must be to sponsor work of the highest professional quality. Too much work in this field has suffered from haste, and from sloppy thought, far more than from the ideological bent of either left and right that has at times afflicted the work of the field, and for which it is sometimes criticized. The second commitment should be towards innovation, to search for new ways, both at the technical and substantive level, that the cause of peace can be fostered in international politics. Finally, the Institute of Peace must become a symbol of the commitment of all Americans towards a peaceful world. It can be a vital center of serious scholarship and lively locus of discussion in the field, bringing together those working arms control and world political questions from the diplomatic or national defense end. I believe that the board of directors can and should pledge to make the new Institute an important component of America's --indeed everybody's--quest for a more peaceful world.

STATEMENT FOR COMPLETION BY PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES

PART I: ALL THE INFORMATION IN THIS PART WILL BE MADE PUBLIC

Name: Thompson (Last) willard (First) scott (Other)

Position to which nominated: Board of Directors, US Institute of Peace

Date of nomination: October 1985

Date of birth: Jan 1 1942 (Day) (Month) (Year)

Place of birth: Providence, R.I.

Marital status: divorced

Full name of spouse: Phyllis Hitze Thompson

Name and ages of children:

Phyllis Elizabeth Pratt Thompson 11

Nicholas Edwin Scott Thompson 10

Heidi Alexandra Hitze Thompson 6

Education:

Institution	Dates attended	Degrees received	Dates of degrees
Phillips Academy	1957-59		High School
Stanford University	1959-63	BA	1963
Oxford University	1963-67	D.Phil	1967

Honors and awards: List below all scholarships, fellowships, honorary degrees, military medals, honorary society memberships, and any other special recognitions for outstanding service or achievement.

Rhodes Scholarship

Danforth Scholarship

Woodrow Wilson Fellowship

[illegible] Fellowship

White House Fellowship

Memberships: List below all memberships and offices held in professional, fraternal, business, scholarly, civic, charitable and other organizations for the last five years and any other prior memberships or offices you consider relevant.

Organization	Office held (if any)	Dates
Council on Foreign Relations		
International Institute of Strategic Studies		
Committee on the Present Danger		
Committee for the Free World		
Board of Directors, Coalition for Peace through Strength		
(1961-63: Vice President, President, Institute of International Rel., Stanford Univ.)		

Employment record: List below all positions held since college, including the title or description of job, name of employer, location of work, and dates of inclusive employment.

Associate Professor of International Politics, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy Tufts University (teaching, research) 1969—present
Associate Director, Programs, USIA 1982-84
Adjunct Professor Georgetown University 1981—present
Senior Fellow, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown Univ, 1981-82
Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, 1975-76
Faculty Research Associate, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy 1967-69
Senior Fellow Center for International Affairs, Harvard Univ., 1980-81
Senior Fellow, Pan-Heuristics Corp. 1979-80 (Marina del Rey, CA)
Director, American Security Council Foundation, 1984
Consultant, Office of the Deputy Under SEcretary of Defense, 1985
Consultant, [illegible] Corp., Silver Springs MD

Government experience: List any advisory, consultative, honorary or other part-time service or positions with Federal, State, or local governments other than those listed above.

Public Member, State Department Promotion Board, Sept-Oct 1976
Delegate, Special Session of the UN (Disarmament) 1982

Published writings: List the titles, publishers and dates of books, articles, reports or other published materials you have written.

Power Projection, 1978, National Strategy Information Center
Strategic Options for the 1980s
From Weakness to Strength, 1980, Institute for Contemporary Studies
Lessons of Vietnam, 1977, Crane Russak
Unequal Partners: Philippine and Thai Relations with the US, 1976, D.C. Heath
Ghana's Foreign Policy, 1969, Princeton Univ. Press
The Third World, 1st Ed., 1980, 2nd 1983, Institute for Contemporary Studies.

plus approximately 100 articles and reviews in scholarly journals, papers, etc.

Political affiliations and activities: List all memberships and offices held in or financial contributions and services rendered to all political parties or election committees during the last five years.

Registered Republican
~~Vice Chairman, Committee for an Effective Presidency, 1980 ($500)~~
Co-Chairman, Democrats and Indepenents for a new President, 1979-80
~~($250)~~

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Future employment relationships:

1. Indicate whether you will sever all connections with your present employer, business firm, association or organization if you are confirmed by the Senate.

NA (Board of Directors appointment)

2. State whether you have any plans after completing government service to resume employment, affiliation or practice with your previous employer, business firm, association or organization.

NA :

3. Has a commitment been made to you for employment after you leave Federal service?

NA

4. Do you intend to serve the full term for which you have been appointed or until the next Presidential election, whichever is applicable?

YES

Potential conflicts of interest:

1. Describe any financial arrangements, deferred compensation agreements or other continuing financial, business or professional dealings with business associates, clients or customers who will be affected by policies which you will influence in the position to which you have been nominated.

none

2. List any investments, obligations, liabilities, or other financial relationships which constitute potential conflicts of interest with the position to which you have been nominated.

none

3. Describe any business relationship, dealing or financial transaction which you have had during the last five years whether for yourself, on behalf of a client, or acting as an agent, that constitutes a potential conflict of interest with the position to which you have been nominated.

Conceivably any of the institutes or professional associations with whihc I have been affiliated could apply to the US Peace Institute for a grant. I would propose to disqualify myself from the consideration on any grant to an organization, faculty or the like with which I am currently affiliated, and would similarly disqualify myself if there were an appearance of conflict with a past organization.

4. List any lobbying activity during the past 10 years in which you have engaged for the purpose of directly or indirectly influencing the passage, defeat or modification of any Federal legislation or of affecting the administration and execution of Federal law or policy.

none

5. Explain how you will resolve any potential conflict of interest that may be disclosed by your responses to the above items.

see above

Answers to Questions for the Board of Directors of the US Institute of Peace.
W. Scott Thompson

1. I have received no instructions from the White House, the State Department, the Defense Department, or ACDA concerning reauthorization of the Institute. I am not familiar with the administration-proposed amendments to the Institute.

2. I believe the Institute's priority should be to initiate research of its own during both the first six months and the first year. I believe that the character and high standards of this research should set the standards for other programs which might be funded elsewhere at a later date.

3. The Institute could have symposia on conflict resolution, it could have exchanges with Soviet scholars and institutes, and it could have conferences on regional conflicts. The purpose is to build common ground between elites who have the capacity to influence the evolution of world order.

4. Peace education might best be developed innovatively with cable television, using program material developed at the institute and inexpensively disseminated nationally to selective audiences at universities, in civic groups, etc.

5. I have had no involvement with the US Institute of Peace prior to my nomination, except to discuss it with certain people who testified on it, including my former dean Theodore Eliot, who testified against the legislation, and with whom I disagreed, and with my other former dean, Edmond Gullion.

6. The by-laws can and must be explicit in prohibiting connections with intelligence agencies, and careful strictures applied to the use of classified material in research.

7. If the Institute is truly well started with serious research, then there should be no confusion about the absence of a policy-making role. Policy-oriented research is fundamentally different from basic social science research, a distinction which I have belabored with my students for over 18 years.

8. I believe that funding is sufficient at this time only to begin a scholarly program of peace research with Fellows of the highest reputation, and to give small seed grants to other institutions. Once the research and conference programs are begun, and have achieved respect for their seriousness and high quality, we should begin to develop satellite programs regionally. I believe it would be a mistake to attempt to develop a full-line program from the beginning. It is of the essence to obtain the highest approbation from the arms control and academic community at the start of the Institute's work.

9. Public participation will come from wide dissemination of the materials developed in workshops, conferences, and the like. The organization 'Search for Common Ground,' for example, has used an innovative framework in television programs to enlarge the sphere of agreement on contentious

issues, and I believe the Peace Institute can do likewise. Likewise, with satellite programs civic leaders, students, and many others may participate in institute programming.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Mr. Thompson. Noting that you are, I think, from New Hampshire, and the brevity of your statement, I'm going to make you an honorary member of the Calvin Coolidge Foundation. [Laughter.]

Dr. Kirkpatrick—we hear that name around here fairly often—we are very happy to welcome you here.

STATEMENT OF EVRON KIRKPATRICK OF BETHESDA, MD

Dr. KIRKPATRICK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and all of you who have spoken, not only the Senators, but Dr. Moore. I think you have set a stage for the work of the Institute.

I myself have had a long history of activity in this field. I would like to give you an example or two, because I think we do need to think in concrete terms about the sort of things that can be done.

I am currently president of an organization, the Helen Dwight Reid Educational Foundation, and I would like to read you from the minutes of not today but of 1962. It gives a report of the things we are doing.

> For the benefit of new trustees, the work of the Foundation, since its inception in 1956, was reviewed. It was noted that a substantial portion of the Foundation's grants had gone to individuals in the form of graduate fellowships, enabling them to study and conduct research in the general area of international understanding. Other types of projects which the Foundation has supported in their initial stages include the efforts of the city of Glen Falls to introduce international relations into the curriculum of the public schools, the creation of the Institute of American Universities in Ex-and-Provence [?], Radcliffe's Institute, and efforts to assist graduates to return to the teaching profession after a prolonged absence.

I think that we will, as a Board, have to come very quickly to quite specific kinds of programs that meet the objectives.

Let me just give one other brief example. I was in the State Department at the end of the war. I went back to the University of Minnesota, where I was associate dean of the social sciences, and during that year I had expressed myself very vigorously about the failure of the State Department to use the resources available in the universities and under foundation support, and Secretary Acheson asked me to come back and organize a program of that sort. I did come back on leave from the University of Minnesota and did set up the program, and then became the first director of it.

I think that all of us need to give serious thought to the general objectives stated in section 61702 of the act, a very effective presentation of the general issues.

I certainly will do everything I can to make it a success, and I am greatly honored to have been nominated to this Board.

[The biographical sketch of Dr. Kirkpatrick and responses to questions submitted to him follow:]

STATEMENT FOR COMPLETION BY PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES

PART I: ALL THE INFORMATION IN THIS PART WILL BE MADE PUBLIC

Name: KIRKPATRICK EVRON MAURICE

Position to which nominated: Member, Board of Dir., U.S. Institute of Peace

Date of nomination: Unknown

Date of birth: August 15, 1911

Place of birth: near Raub, Indiana

Marital status: Married

Full name of spouse: Jeane Duane Jordan Kirkpatrick

Name and ages of children:
Douglas J. Kirkpatrick, 29
John E. Kirkpatrick, 27
Stuart A. Kirkpatrick, 26

Education:

Institution	Dates attended	Degrees received	Dates of degrees
Univ. of Illinois	1928-33	BA; MA	1932; 1933
Yale Univ.	1933-35	Ph.D.	1939
Indiana Univ.		LL.D.	1977

Honors and awards: List below all scholarships, fellowships, honorary degrees, military medals, honorary society memberships, and any other special recognitions for outstanding service or achievement.

See attached curriculum vita

Memberships: List below all memberships and offices held in professional, fraternal, business, scholarly, civic, charitable and other organizations for the last five years and any other prior memberships or offices you consider relevant.

Organization	Office held (if any)	Dates
See attached curriculum vita		

Employment record: List below all positions held since college, including the title or description of job, name of employer, location of work, and dates of inclusive employment.

See attached curriculum vita

Government experience: List any advisory, consultative, honorary or other part-time service or positions with Federal, State, or local governments other than those listed above.

See attached curriculum vita

Published writings: List the titles, publishers and dates of books, articles, reports or other published materials you have written.

See attached curriculum vita

Political affiliations and activities: List all memberships and offices held in or financial contributions and services rendered to all political parties or election committees during the last five years.

None

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Evron M. Kirkpatrick

Personal Data

Born near Raub, Indiana, August 15, 1911; son of Omer and Lenna Mae (Haines) Kirkpatrick
Married to Jeane D. Jordan, five children
Home address: 6812 Granby Street, Bethesda, Maryland 20817
Business addresses: 4000 Albemarle Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20016
American Enterprise Institute, 1150 17th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036

Educational Background

B.A., with high honors, University of Illinois, 1932 (Phi Beta Kappa)
A.M., University of Illinois, 1933
Ph.D., Yale University, 1939 (Cowles Fellow in Government, 1933-35)
LL.D., Indiana University, 1977

Experience

President, Helen Dwight Reid Educational Foundation, 1972 - ; Trustee, 1960 -
Resident Scholar, American Enterprise Institute, 1981 -
Professorial Lecturer, Georgetown University, 1959-1984
Executive Director, American Political Science Association, 1954-1981
Lecturer, Howard University, 1957-1961
Deputy Director, Office of Intelligence Research, Department of State, 1954
Chief, Psychological Intelligence and Research Staff, Department of State, 1952-1954
Chief, External Research Staff, Department of State, 1948-1952
Intelligence Program Adviser, Department of State, 1947
Assistant Research Director and Projects Control Officer, Research and Intelligence, Department of State, 1946
Assistant Research Director, Research and Analysis, O.S.S., 1945
Chairman, Social Science Division, University of Minnesota, 1944-1948
Professor, University of Minnesota, 1948
Associate Professor, University of Minnesota, 1943-1948
Assistant Professor, University of Minnesota, 1939-1943
Instructor in political science, University of Minnesota, 1935-1939

Public Activities

Member, National Arbitration Association (Board of Arbitrators), 1943-1947
Member, Advisory Committee on Foreign Affairs, Southern Regional Education Board, 1952-1956
Director, Governmental Affairs Institute, 1954-1964
Chairman, Board of Trustees, Organization for Public Research, 1955 -
Trustee, Citizenship Clearing House, 1956-1962
Trustee, National Center for Education in Politics, 1962-1967
Chairman, Board of Trustees, Institute for American Universities, Aix-en-Provence, France, and Canterbury, England, 1958 -
Council, International Political Science Association, 1955-1967
Executive Committee, International Political Science Association, 1958-1964
Executive Committee, Pi Sigma Alpha, 1958 - ; President, 1974-1976
Member, Commission on Presidential Campaign Debates, 1963-1964
Member, President Kennedy's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation, 1963-1964
Consultant, National Educational Television, 1963-1965

(Public Activities - Cont.)

Member, President Johnson's Task Force on Career Advancement in the Federal Service, 1966
Member, Editorial Advisory Committee, Who's Who in American Politics, 1966-1976
Member, Advisory Committee for Social and Behavioral Sciences Section, American Men of Science, 1967-1978
President, American Peace Society, 1969 - ; Secretary, 1967-1969
Member, Division of Behavioral Sciences, National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, 1963-1966
Member, Committee on International Relations in the Behavioral Sciences, National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, 1964-1970
Member, Board of Advisors, A Presidential Classroom for Young Americans, 1968-1976

Publications and Editorial Experience

Editorial Adviser in political science, Henry Holt and Co., 1952-1960
Editorial Adviser in political science, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960-1968

Author or Editor:

The People, Politics, and the Politician, 1941, revised (with A.N. Christensen), 1950, 1953 (Henry Holt and Co.)
Running the Country (with A.N. Christensen), 1946 (Henry Holt and Co.)
Target: The World; Communist Propaganda Activities in 1955, 1956 (Macmillan)
Elections-USA (with Jeane Kirkpatrick), 1976 (Henry Holt and Co.)
Year of Crisis: An Analysis of Communist Propaganda Activities in 1956, 1957 (Macmillan)
"'Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System': Political Science, Policy Science or Pseudo Science?" Paper delivered at the 1970 Annual Meeting of the APSA published in the December 1971 American Political Science Review
"Political Science From Past to Present," in Foundations of Political Science, edited by Donald Freeman, 1983 (The Free Press)
"Presidential Candidate 'Debates': What Can We Learn From 1960?" in The Past and Future of Presidential Debates, edited by Austin Ranney (Washington: American Enterprise Institute, 1979)
Editor, World Affairs, 1980 -

Contributing Author:

Man and Society, 1938 (Prentice Hall)
Essays on the Behavioral Study of Politics, 1962 (University of Illinois Press)
Perspectives, 1963 (Houghton Mifflin Co.)
Encyclopedia Britannica
Encyclopedia Americana

Awards

Ll. D., Indiana University, 1977
American Political Science Association, Charles E. Merriam Award, 1980
American Political Science Association, Committee on the Status of Blacks in the Profession Award, 1980
National Capital Area Political Science Association, Pi Sigma Alpha Award, 1981

Future employment relationships:

1. Indicate whether you will sever all connections with your present employer, business firm, association or organization if you are confirmed by the Senate.

No

2. State whether you have any plans after completing government service to resume employment, affiliation or practice with your previous employer, business firm, association or organization.

; I plan to continue current relationships

3. Has a commitment been made to you for employment after you leave Federal service?

I plan to continue all current relationships.

4. Do you intend to serve the full term for which you have been appointed or until the next Presidential election, whichever is applicable?

Yes

Potential conflicts of interest:

1. Describe any financial arrangements, deferred compensation agreements or other continuing financial, business or professional dealings with business associates, clients or customers who will be affected by policies which you will influence in the position to which you have been nominated.

None

2. List any investments, obligations, liabilities, or other financial relationships which constitute potential conflicts of interest with the position to which you have been nominated.

None

3. Describe any business relationship, dealing or financial transaction which you have had during the last five years whether for yourself, on behalf of a client, or acting as an agent, that constitutes a potential conflict of interest with the position to which you have been nominated.

None

4. List any lobbying activity during the past 10 years in which you have engaged for the purpose of directly or indirectly influencing the passage, defeat or modification of any Federal legislation or of affecting the administration and execution of Federal law or policy.

None

5. Explain how you will resolve any potential conflict of interest that may be disclosed by your responses to the above items.

N/A

EVRON M. KIRKPATRICK RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS FOR CANDIDATES FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

1. I have received no instructions from anyone with respect to reauthorization of the Institute. I am not familiar with the administration's proposed amendments and, therefore, have no position with respect to them.

2. The activities I consider most important are: 1) support of the Jennings Randolph Center for International Peace; 2) support of research about or development of educational programs to reach students in secondary schools; 3) educational programs to train prospective teachers in techniques for improving international understanding; 4) fellowship programs to bring teachers in foreign countries through internship programs in U.S. schools; 5) I would put a high priority on providing journalists opportunities to increase their knowledge of conflict resolution research and how it might be used in gaining understanding.

3. Answered in 2 above.

4. Answered in 2 above.

5. None

6. I believe that use of classified information should be kept to the minimum. In activities of the Institute, the Directors should review proposals and the final activities.

7. I strongly support the proposition that the Institute is not to make or implement U.S. foreign policy. The Board of Directors will have to make this clear in establishing administrative rules and regulations. In reviewing the activities of the Institute, the Board will have to see that these regulations are enforced.

8. I believe that the Institute should develop its own programs, courses, and public educational activities. At the same time, I think it important that there be substantial cooperation with local educational institutions, labor unions, business organizations, and churches. I think it desirable to move slowly in establishing satellite branches and that such branches be integrated into and make use of local educational institutions, labor, churches, and foundations. The strength of the Institute will depend to a large extent on support of local public opinion.

   I, personally, have been much interested in conflict resolution research. I believe it important that the Board make use of developments in this field and encourage such research by others. The Carter Center for Policy Studies at Emory University is an example of one of the many centers that the Board should work with.

9. I have already commented on this question in 8 above. I repeat what I said there. The success of the Institute will depend on how successful it is in enlisting local institutions and organizations in developing the Institute programs. For example, the Institute can do a great deal to bring lcoal schools and universities into contact with people.

9 (cont.) I am certain that it will be desirable to establish programs using outstanding members of the press. As Executive Director of the American Political Science Association, President of the Helen Dwight Reid Educational Foundation, and as President of the American Peace Society, I have been active in developing such programs. The APSA, during my years there, developed the Congressional Fellowship Program that brought young journalists and political scientists to work for a year on the staffs of members of Congress: one-half year for a House member or committee and one-half year for a Senate member or committee. In recent years, the APSA has included a group of State Department officers in this program. It would be interesting to bring persons from local organizations into this or a comparable program.

As a member of the Board, I hope to submit some proposals that the Board can consider. Doing so will give me an opportunity to extend and support what I have been concerned with for the past fifty years.

Evron M. Kirkpatrick

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Dr. Kirkpatrick. We now have gotten to you, Dr. Bark, and I do understand that Senator Hatfield may have had some association with Stanford University also—and Hoover.

STATEMENT OF DENNIS BARK OF STANFORD, CA

Dr. BARK.

Senator Stafford, Senator Hatfield, Senator Matsunaga, Senator Randolph, I am delighted to be here this morning, since I consider it both a privilege and a very serious responsibility to have been nominated for the position that you are considering.

For the past 16 years I have been associated with the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University, where I am a senior fellow and direct our program in national security affairs.

The Hoover Institution was founded by Herbert Hoover in 1919, just after what was known as the Great War, and was dedicated to the study of the causes of war and revolution and to the study of the paths that lead to freedom and peace.

Today it is the largest private archive and library in the United States that documents social, economic, and political change in the 20th century.

As a result, its resources attract annually scholars from almost every State in the Union and from every continent in the world; and from most countries in the world.

From the discussions that I have had with these scholars over the past decade and a half, one central concern emerges, again and again; it is the universal concern with peace and the paths that can lead to it.

I recognize that this concern comes as no surprise, but at the same time I think it is very often the obvious that deserves attention. It is therefore precisely this matter of peace that underscores the importance of the United States Institute of Peace.

The United States has long been committed to the defense of peace. The United States Institute of Peace presents a unique opportunity to serve the promotion of peace. I strongly believe in this purpose and I would welcome the opportunity to be a part of this endeavor.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Bark, his curriculum vitae, and responses to questions submitted to him follow:]

Testimony of

Dennis L. Bark
Senior Fellow
Hoover Institution, Stanford University

Presented to the

Senate Subcommittee

on

Education, Arts and Humanities

United States Senate
Washington, D.C.

October 24, 1985

Mr. Chairman:
Members of the Committee:

It is a privilege to be nominated to serve as a director of the United States Institute of Peace. It represents the opportunity to serve our country in an area of vital national interest -- an area which is the focus of attention by people concerned with maintaining peace throughout the world.

For the past fifteen years I have been associated with the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University. It is an institution founded by the thirty-fourth President of the United States. In his dedication of the Hoover tower building in 1941, several months before the attack on Pearl Harbor, Mr. Hoover spoke about the library and archival resources of the Institution as follows: "...here are the documents which record the suffering, the self-denial, the devotion, the heroic deeds of men. Surely from these records there can be help to mankind in its confusions and perplexities, and its yearnings for peace.

The purpose of this institution is to promote peace."

Today, more than four decades have passed since Mr. Hoover spoke the latter words, and the successful promotion of peace remains a matter of critical and uncontestable importance. During the past decade and one half that I have been part of the Hoover Institution, I have had the good fortune to meet men and women from every continent in the world and to discuss with them our concern with peace in a stable world, and the exchange of ideas concerning the various paths one may take in order to achieve this goal. From these discussions one thing emerges clearly, again and again, and that is that all people in the world have in common the yearning for peace of which Mr. Hoover spoke almost half a century ago -- echoing the concerns of men and women from all walks of life who preceeded and followed him.

It is for this reason that I would consider it both a responsibility and an honor to serve on the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace; for I endorse the abiding concern for preserving a peaceful world that lies at the heart of the legislation creating the

Institute. The opportunities for the Institute to contribute to the promotion of peace will be many and varied. With imaginative leadership and balanced direction the Institute can encourage the exploration of all paths that may lead to peace. It can stimulate the interest of our nation's citizens in the continuing process of peace. And it can help to challenge the spirit and creative powers of the minds of the men and women of the United States to develop constructive alternatives to conflict and strife.

In the "United States Institute of Peace Act" of October 19, 1984 the language used to describe the Institute's purpose is very close in meaning to the words with which Herbert Hoover dedicated the Hoover tower building in 1941. They are important words which need to be kept in the forefront of our minds, and therefore I want to recall them here. The purpose of the Institute is "...to serve the people and the Government through the widest possible range of education and training, basic and applied research opportunities, and peace information services on the means to promote international peace and the resolution of conflicts among the nations and peoples of the world without recourse to violence."

I share the earnest conviction as well as the hopes which these latter words set forth and underscore. The Institute's work can and must represent an "investment" in our nation's future as a free and peaceful country, as we endeavor to contribute as a nation to the preservation and to the future of a free and peaceful world. This effort is of fundamental importance, and is necessary to human existence. I would, therefore, welcome the opportunity to participate in this effort as a direction of the United States Institute of Peace.

HOOVER INSTITUTION
ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE
Stanford, California 94305-2323

Vita of Dennis Leistner Bark

BORN: March, 30 1942, Appleton, Wisconsin. Son of Professor and Mrs. William C. Bark. Father is Professor of History, Emeritus, Stanford University. Married with three stepchildren.

CURSUS, 1964-1970:

A.B. in History, Stanford University, 1964; minor in Theater.

Basic training and service with United States Coast Guard Reserve, 1964-1968.

American Institute for Foreign Trade, September 1965-February 1966.

Linguistic studies in preparation for advanced study in Europe, Stanford University, March-August, 1966.

Candidate for degree of Ph.D., Free University of Berlin, October 1966 - January 1970, in Modern European History and Political Science. Dissertation entitled: Berlin: Containment and Negotiation, written under supervision of Professor Dr. Hans Herzfeld. Members of the Doctoral Committee: Professor Hans Herzfeld, Professor Wilhelm Berges, Professor Georg Kotowski, Professor Richard Loewenthal, Professor Hans-Dieter Loeck.

Ph.D. awarded "summa cum laude," January, 1970, in History and Political Science, Free University of Berlin.

H.B. Earhart Fellow, 1966-1968.
Hoover Fellow for study in Germany, 1968-1970.
Fellow of the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung, 1968-1970.
During the Fellowship, Dr. Bark was jointly a Fellow of the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung and of the Fritz Thyssen Stiftung.

Dissertation selected for publication as a book by the Historical Commission of Berlin.

Member, President's Commission on White House Fellowships, May 1981 —

Chairman, United States Coast Guard Academy Advisory Committee, October 1981-1984.

Chairman, Board of Trustees, Earhart Foundation

Director, Parrott Ranch Company

Member, Advisory Board, Chronicle Information Services

Corresponding Member, Berlin Wissenschaftliche Gesellschaft (Berlin Learned Society)

Member, Mont Pelerin Society.

Woodrow Wilson Fellow, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington, D.C., 1974.

National Fellow, Hoover Institution, 1970-1972.

Dr. Bark received First Prize in French poetry sponsored by the French Consulate General, San Francisco, 1966.

Dr. Bark was presented the Meritorious Public Service Award by the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard in October 1984.

PRESENT STATUS:

Associate Director and Senior Fellow (in August 1983 Dr. Bark resigned as Deputy Director because of illness). Dr. Bark conducts his own research on international relations and directs the National Security Affairs Program of the Hoover Institution.

Appointed Deputy Director and Senior Fellow, March 1982.

Appointed Associate Director and Senior Research Fellow, December 1, 1978.

Appointed Assistant Director and Senior Research Fellow, September 1, 1976.

Appointed Assistant Director (in charge of Publications and the National, Peace and Public Affairs Fellows Programs) and Research Fellow of the Hoover Institution, July 1, 1975.

Appointed Executive Secretary of the National, Peace and Public Affairs Fellows Program and Research Fellow of the Hoover Institution on June 1, 1973 (on leave as Woodrow Wilson Fellow March 1 - June 30, 1974, at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington, D.C.).

Appointed Assistant to the Director and Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution on September 1, 1972.

Awarded a National Fellowship at the Hoover Institution September 1, 1970 - August 31, 1972.

Dr. Bark has lectured at the Free University of Berlin, and at Stanford University. He has participated in seminars and conferences sponsored by various groups in Europe and the United States and in the Far East on the problems of Berlin and West German foreign policy, on problems of European security, on relations between Western Europe and the United States, and on national security affairs.

TRAVEL: He has traveled widely in Western Europe, and to a lesser extent in Eastern Europe. Dr. Bark resided in West Berlin from 1966 until 1970, and has traveled to Europe on numerous occasions prior to and since that time.

BOOKS: *To Promote Peace: U.S. Foreign Policy in the Mid-1980s* (editor). Hoover Institution Press, 1984, 288 pp.

Agreement on Berlin. A Study of the 1970-1972 Quadripartite Negotiations. Hoover Institution-American Enterprise Institute policy study series. American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, D.C., 1974, 131 pp.

Die Berlin-Frage 1949-1955. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin and New York, 1972, 544 pp.

Since 1972, Dr. Bark has been Associate Editor for Western Europe for the *Yearbook on International Communist Affairs*, published annually by the Hoover Institution Press.

Coordinator, 1979-1980, of "The 1980s Project," whose principal volume, *The United States in the 1980s*, was published by the Hoover Institution Press in 1980 and edited by Peter Duignan and Alvin Rabushka. The volume contains twenty-nine essays on major domestic and foreign policy issues facing the United States in the decade of the 1980s, and includes contributions from Milton and Rose Friedman, Ray S. Cline, Alan Greenspan, Fred C. Ikle, Seymour Martin Lipset, Martin Anderson, Michael Boskin, Murray Weidenbaum, Edward Teller, P. T. Bauer, Robert A. Scalapino and Alfred Grosser.

ARTICLES AND PAPERS (excluding book reviews and papers for private circulation):

-- "Changing East-West Relations in Europe — The Bonn/Moscow Treaty of August 1970." Address delivered to the Commonwealth Club of California in San Francisco, December 18, 1970.

** The address is reprinted in: *Vital Speeches of the Day*, Vol. XXXVII, No. 7, January 15, 1971; *Congressional Record*, 92nd Congress, Vol. 117, No. 1, January 21, 1971, pp. 46-47; *International Political Science Abstracts* (as an abstract), Paris, 1972.

**: The address appeared in translation as: "Die Veraenderung der Ost-West-Beziehungen in Europa. Der deutsch-sowjetische Vertrag vom August 1970. "Sozialwissenschaftliches Forschungsinstitut der Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, Bonn, August 1971. It was distributed, in translation, by the Chairman of the CDU parliamentary committee on foreign affairs, defense, development and intra-German policy, to all members of the CDU/CSU fraction of the West German parliament.

** The address was revised and appeared as an article entitled: "Changing East-West Relations in Europe: The Bonn-Moscow Treaty of August 1970," in *ORBIS*, Vol. XV, No. 2, Summer, 1971, pp. 625-642.

  ** This article is reprinted in *Current Issues of International Politics*, Morton Kaplan editor, 2nd ed., (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1974), pp. 387-397.

— Four articles on the Communist parties of Austria, Switzerland, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands on their activity during the year 1970, in: *1971 Yearbook on International Communist Affairs*, Hoover Institution Press, 1971, pp. 119-126, 221-224, 225-230, 261-265.

— "Berlin: 'Acceptable' and 'Satisfactory' Agreements." This article was written for a study of European affairs for the Foreign Policy Research Institute, Philadelphia, June 1971.

— " 'Ostpolitik' — Soviet-American Relations with a Changing Europe." *Congressional Record*, 92nd Congress, Vol. 117, No. 127--Part III, August 6, 1971, pp. 9027-9031.

— " 'Ostpolitik' — The Implications for Western European Security." This paper was written for a study of European affairs for the Foreign Policy Research Institute, Philadelphia, December 1971.

— Four articles on the activities of the Communist parties of Austria, Switzerland, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands during the year 1971, in: *1972 Yearbook on International Communist Affairs*, Hoover Institution Press, 1972, pp. 117-124, 200-203, 203-209, 231-237.

— "Europe and Detente in the 1970's." *Congressional Record*, 92nd Congress, Vol. 118, No. 30, March 1, 1972, pp. 1743-1747.

— "Impressions of Student Life in Germany Today." *Central Europe Journal*, July/August, 1972, pp. 257-267.

  ** This article appeared in abridged form in the German language, entitled "Das Dilemma der Liberalen an den Universitaeten," *Student*, January/February 1973.

— Four articles on the activities of the Communist parties of Austria, Switzerland, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands during the year 1972, in: *1973 Yearbook of International Communist Affairs*, Hoover Institution Press, 1973, pp. 117-123, 197-200, 201-206, 227-229.

— "Public Opinion, Peaceful Coexistence and Foreign Policy," *Issues & Studies*, March 1973, pp. 13-24. The same article appears in the Japanese language edition of *Issues and Studies* on April 1, 1973.

— One article on the activities of the Communist party of Luxembourg during the 1974, in: *1975 Yearbook on International Communist Affairs*, Hoover Institution Press, 1975, pp. 217-219.

— "A Time to Every Purpose. Western Europe and the United States in the 1970's." The paper was delivered in German at the meeting of the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung in Bad Bruckenau, Federal Republic of Germany, September 15, 1974.

  ** This address was published under the title "A Time to Every Purpose: Western Europe and the United States in the 1970's," *Lugano Review*, 1975/I., pp. 7-9, 19.

  ** "Alles Vornehmen hat seine Stunde. Anmerkungen zur Europaeisch-

Amerikanischen Partnerschaft in den Siebziger Jahren," in: *Tradition und Neubeginn. Internationale Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte im 20. Jahrhundert*, Carl Heymanns Verlag KG, Berlin, Bonn & Munich, 1975 (December), pp. 539-550.

— One article on the activites of the Communist party of Luxembourg during the year 1975, in: *1976 Yearbook on International Communist Affairs*, Hoover Institution Press, 1976, p. 193.

— One article on the activities of the Communist party of Switzerland during the year 1977, in: *1978 Yearbook on International Communist Affairs*, Hoover Institution Press, 1978, pp. 207-210.

— One article on the activities of the Communist party of Switzerland during the year 1978, in: *1979 Yearbook on International Communist Affairs*, Hoover Institution Press, 1979, pp. 209-212.

— "Western Europe," in *1982 Yearbook on International Communist Affairs*, Hoover Institution Press, 1982, pp. 244-249.

— "MPS Notes Berlin Wall's 21st Anniversary," in *The Mont Pelerin Society Newsletter*, February 1983.

— "Western Europe," in *1983 Yearbook on International Communist Affairs*, Hoover Institution Press, 1983, pp. 398-404.

— "Nota Bene" (in the preface) in: *Pierre Laval devant l'Histoire*, Rene de Chambrun, Editions France-Empire, Paris, 1983, pp. 12-13.

— "Why not Capture this Rare Academic Prize?" in: *The Peninsula Times Tribune*, October 9, 1983.

— "Bork Urges Compromise on Center," *Campus Report*, January 25, 1984.

— "Western Europe," in 1984 *Yearbook on International Communist Affairs*, Hoover Institution Press, 1984, pp. 437-443.

— "United States Security and World Peace," in *Vital Speeches of the Day*, April 15, 1984.

HOOVER INSTITUTION
ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE
Stanford, California 94305-2323

DENNIS LAISTNER BARK

Dennis Laistner Bark, Associate Director and Senior Fellow of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, is a political scientist and historian in the field of West European studies who has written and lectured extensively on foreign affairs and relations between Western Europe and the United States, with special emphasis on Berlin and Germany.

Dr. Bark received an A.B. degree in History from Stanford University in 1964 and a Ph.D. degree in Modern European History and Political Science, "summa cum laude", from the Free University of Berlin in 1970. He was also educated at the American Institute for Foreign Trade, 1965-66. During 1966-68, he was an H. B. Earhart Fellow; in 1968-70 a Fellow of the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung; and in 1970-72, a National Fellow at the Hoover Institution. Dr. Bark was a Woodrow Wilson Fellow at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, D.C. during 1974.

In 1972 he joined the staff of the Hoover Institution as Assistant to the Director and Research Fellow. In 1973 he became Executive Secretary of the National, Peace, and Public Affairs Fellows Program, a position he held until 1984. He was appointed Assistant Director and Senior Research Fellow in 1976 and Associate Director in 1978. Dr. Bark became a Senior Fellow and Deputy Director in 1981, and resigned this latter position in August 1983 as a consequence of illness. As a Senior Fellow and Associate Director of the Hoover Institution Dr. Bark conducts his own research on international relations and directs the Institution's program in National Security Affairs.

The author of *Die Berlin-Frage 1949-1955* (Walter de Gruyter, 1972) and *Agreement on Berlin: A Study of the 1970-72 Quadripartite Negotiations* (American Enterprise Institute-Hoover Institution, 1974); Editor of *To Promote Peace: U.S. Foreign Policy in the Mid-1980s* (Hoover Institution Press, 1984). Dr. Bark has written articles on foreign relations for both American and European journals. Since 1972, he has been the Associate Editor for Western Europe of the *Yearbook on International Communist Affairs*. During 1979-80 he directed "The 1980s Project," whose principal volume, *The United States in the 1980s*, was published by the Hoover Institution Press in 1980.

In the 1980 national election campaign, Dr. Bark was a Foreign Policy Adviser and a member of former Governor Reagan's Task Force on Western Europe. He is a member of the President's Commission on White House Fellowships, and served as Chairman, United States Coast Guard Academy Advisory Committee from 1981 to 1984. He is a Corresponding Member of the Berlin Wissenschaftliche Gesellschaft, and is a member of the Mont Pelerin Society. He is also Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Earhart Foundation.

QUESTIONS FOR CANDIDATES FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

1. Have you received any instructions from the White House, the State Department, the Defense Department or the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency concerning reauthorization of the Institute? Are you familiar with the Administration-proposed amendments to the Institute and if so, what is your position?

2. The U. S. Institute of Peace Act authorizes the Institute to carry out a number of activities including research of its own, the funding of research at other institutions, education and training at the graduate and post-graduate levels, continuing education, information services, and the Jennings Randolph Center for International Peace. Which of these activities do you think should receive priority during the next six months? During the next year?

3. What sort of symposia and training programs will you initiate, and for whom, and to what purpose?

4. Do you have any ideas on how you might use grants to fund peace education?

5. What involvement, if any, have you had with the United States Institute of Peace prior to your nomination for its Board--during the long legislative history, and through your publications or speeches?

6. What will you do to ensure that the Institute's independence, reputation, or credibility is not compromised by covert intelligence action, any misuse of the Institute's potential access to classified materials or association with the various intelligence agencies?

7. This Committee has emphasized that the Institute is not to make U. S. foreign policy or to implement it. What will you do to ensure that it does not perform a policy making or implementation role?

8. It has been this Committee's intent that the Institute develop its own programs, courses, publications and public educational activities, that the Institute provide grants to existing institutions to strengthen and expand their programs, and that the Institute establish a series of satellite branches across the nation. What is your intention to develop the Institute along these lines?

9. What will you do to ensure that the public may fully participate in the Institute's programs, rather than creating or catering to an elite of specialists?

HOOVER INSTITUTION
ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE
Stanford, California 94305-2323

Dennis L. Bark
Senior Fellow
Hoover Institution

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS FOR CANDIDATES FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE -- November 18, 1985

1. I have received no instructions from The White House, the State Department, the Defense Department or the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency concerning reauthorization of the Institute. I am unfamiliar with the Administration-proposed amendments to the Institute.

2. The first priority, following location of a building, appointment of a staff, and establishment of guidelines for operation, should be a thorough review of research concerning all aspects contributing to the process of peace. When such a review has been completed it should then be possible to determine an order of priorities among those authorized by the U.S. Institute of Peace Act.

3. The initiation of symposia and training programs should follow as a consequence of the thorough review discussed in the response to question number two. Until such a review has been completed and discussed it is not possible to know what kind of initiatives should be undertaken by the Institute.

4. It is clear that support of programs designed to contribute to the educational process concerning the importance of maintaining peace is a major responsibility set forth in the U.S. Institute of Peace Act. How grants may be used to support peace education should be determined following a detailed review of efforts and projects currently underway in this area.

5. None.

6. The concern reflected in this question is one of the responsibilities of the Board of Directors, and should be the subject of systematic overview by the Board of Directors. The Directors would be remiss

in failing to do so. My own concern is to ensure that I, and my fellow directors, meet the responsibilities with which they are charged by the U.S. Institute of Peace Act, and I intend to so.

7. This question is of major importance, and will be of continual concern to the Board of Directors. To ensure that the Institute does not perform a policy making or implementation role all of the programs supported by the Institute must be reviewed on a regular basis. In this regard, the chief executive officer of the Institute will be charged with this responsibility as well.

8. The development of the Institute along the lines described in question number eight will be of major importance to the Board of Directors. Given the tremendous concern with all aspects of the peace process shared by citizens across the country, in every state in the Union, every effort should be made to develop and to support programs, courses, publications and public educational activities. Following a thorough review of existing programs, courses, publications and public educational activities the Board of Directors should be in a position to make constructive recommendations on these matters.

9. This question is closely connected to question number eight, and should properly be answered in the same way. That is to say, following a review of existing programs, courses, publications and public educational activities the Board of Directors will be in the position to make positive recommendations concerning programs that can and will involve the public as a whole.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Dr. Bark.

Mr. Weinrod, we would be glad to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF W. BRUCE WEINROD OF WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. WEINROD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Senator Hatfield, Sentor Matsunaga, and Senator Randolph, I am honored to have been nominated by the President of the United States to be a member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace.

In response to your request, I am pleased to provide some brief thoughts on matters of interest to the Committee.

First, I agree with and endorse the comments already made by my fellow nominees. And let me provide just a very brief overview of some of the thoughts I have at this preliminary time on the activities of the Institute.

At this early point, I believe it would be premature to have a definite position on specific Institute programs and projects. While I have certainly thought about these matters, I would want to do so in much greater detail were I to become a member of the Board.

I would want to begin with an overall review of the background of the creation of the Institute, in looking to the intent of the Congress and particularly to those members with a longstanding interest in the Institute as well as the studies that have been done, and I would certainly want to discuss the Institute with many of the people who were involved in outside organizations who have been pursuing this endeavor for many years.

I would then want to catalog what has already been done in the area and what is currently being done in the area of peace and conflict-resolution analysis.

I believe the primary functions of the Institute should be in the areas of research, compiling information, and encouraging meetings and conferences.

The Institute's efforts should ensure that diverse viewpoints are represented.

The Institute should not be involved in a direct way in the policy or political process.

The Institute should be nonpartisan in its activities, and it should conduct its activities in a fiscally responsible manner with systematic reviews of programming to make sure that this is being done.

The Institute should develop a center for the short-term residence of scholars and others with relevant backgrounds and expertise.

And the Institute should consider ways in which its activities and output can involve and be made available to the nonexpert as well as the expert.

The Institute should among other things act as a catalyst for existing institutions and programs.

The Institute should seek to utilize traditional disciplines such as history and classical political philosophy as well as the insight of important religious traditions, and more contemporary approaches, such as quantitative analysis.

I will try to close at that point. My personal background and qualifications, I believe, are mentioned in my prepared testimony, but let me say that I have for a number of years been involved in a number of activities involved in the general area of trying to improve mutual understanding, and particularly with one organization which is involved in exchange activities of young public officials and political leaders—and I have just been involved in this very recently at—Middlebury College with a meeting with a number of Soviet visitors in a 3-day conference, and I will be going over as cochairman of a similar group to the Soviet Union in December.

So I am very much involved and interested in these kinds of things. I know that Senator Matsunaga mentioned not only current leaders but potential leaders as benefitting from this kind of activity. And I certainly would like to see that and perhaps including discussions that last for more than just a very short period, where people can have lengthier discussions.

But I would also want to try to ensure that people representing the other side, in the case of the Soviet side, were people who are really a part of their political system rather than just people that they sometimes bring out for purposes of discussion.

Let me conclude by saying that I sincerely believe the Institute can play a useful, constructive role in the better understanding of important questions pertaining to how best to achieve best and how best to resolve potential conflict.

I am honored to have been nominated for this position and I thank you for the opportunity to appear here and express my thoughts.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Weinrod, his biographical sketch, and responses to questions submitted to him follow:]

TESTIMONY OF W. BRUCE WEINROD
NOMINEE FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES
OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

OCTOBER 24, 1985

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, I am honored to have been nominated by the President of the United States as a member of the Board of Directors of the U.S. Institute of Peace. In response to your request, I am pleased to provide my thoughts on matters of interest to the Subcommittee.

The Peace Institute

First, let me say that I think it would be a mistake to have too firm a set of views on the Institute and its activities at this early point. Were I to become a Board member, I would certainly want to discuss the Institute with many people before arriving at definitive judgements. In this regard, I would of course want to look to the intent of Congress itself, which created the Institute, and particularly to the thoughts of those members of Congress who have taken a longstanding interest in its fate. I would also want to obtain thoughts of the leaders of organizations which have urged creation of the Institute.

I would, of course, factor in my own thinking. At this point, it is impossible to have a detailed plan or program, but I can offer some general guidelines as to how I would approach the activities of the Institute:

-I would want to begin with an overall review of the background of the creation of the Institute. As former Senator Jennings Randolph put it: "the proper beginning ... requires an appreciation of the history of the ideas and particularly of the themes which have marked the legislative debate ..."

-the focus of the Institute's activities should be primarily on non-military approaches to conflicts which affect the nation's security and well-being.

-the primary functions of the Institute should be in the areas of research, compiling information and encouraging meetings and conferences.

-the Institute's efforts should ensure that diverse viewpoints are represented.

-the Institute should not be involved in a direct way in the policy or political process.

-the Institute should be non-partisan in its activities.

-the Institute should conduct its activities in a fiscally responsible manner.

-the Institute should develop a center for the short-term residence of scholars and others with relevant backgrounds and expertise. Such residents should be required to produce very specific work during their stay at the center.

-the Institute should consider ways in which its activities and output can involve, and be made available to, the non-expert as well as the expert.

-the Institute should among other things act as a catalyst for existing institutions and programs.

-the Institute should seek to utilize traditional disciplines such as history and classical political philosophy, as well as the insight of important religious traditions, as well as more contemporary approaches such as quantitative analysis.

-the Institute should always bear in mind in its efforts the fact that at the present time, unfortunately, similar independent efforts cannot be conducted in the territory of our principal world adversary, the Soviet Union.

-the Institute's focus should properly be on peace and conflict resolution; but any peace sought or achieved must always be one which preserves and protects freedom, as well as the istitution's and values of Western civilization.

Again, let me stress that these are preliminary thoughts. Since neither the structure of the Institute nor the Board itself is yet in being, it is not yet possible to have all of the necessary information to make full judgements.

Personal Qualifications and Experience

In a general sense, membership on a Board of Directors calls for an ability to understand organizational and administrative problems and concerns, and to deal with them effectively. This is even more true with an organization that has to be developed from its inception.

I believe that my many years of managerial and administrative experience well qualify me for such a role. As the background materials submitted to the Subcommittee indicate, I have served as Executive Director of a major organization involved in international exchange activities (the American Council of Young Political Leaders), Legislative Director for close to three years to a U.S. Senator, (Senator John Heinz) supervising a large legislative staff, and currently as Director of Foreign Policy and Defense Studies at The Heritage Foundation. In addition, I currently serve on the Board of Directors of three organizations.

In a specific sense, the Peace Institute is an organization which will be considering both long and short-term policy issues related to the resolution of conflict and related issues of international relations. My graduate school work (at the University of Pennsylvania) was in international relations, and my law school curriculum (Georgetown University) emphasized international law. Further, much of my professional experience has been in the field of international affairs and related issues. At the same time, my practical experience in government positions would enable me, I believe, to relate long and short-term issues of conflict resolution to the realities and priorities of the political process. This skill in turn would help me to participate in the determination of reasonable priorities for the Institute.

For a number of years, I have been deeply involved with the bipartisan American Council of Young Political Leaders. It conducts many exchange programs with younger public officials and political leaders from the U.S. and many other nations. One of the principal purposes of this organization is precisely to further international understanding as part of an effort to reduce the possibilities of conflict in the future. In addition to many other programs, exchanges are conducted with the Soviet Union. In fact, very recently I served as Co-Chairman of a U.S. delegation at a three day conference with a visiting Soviet delegation at Middlebury College in Vermont. In the near future, I expect to serve as Co-Chairman of a U.S. delegation visiting the Soviet Union. Obviously, these are modest efforts in the scheme of things, but they are consistent with objectives of the Institute.

I have also been involved in the work of the Foreign Student Service Council whose objective among others is to provide a full and balanced perspective on the U.S. public policy process for foreign students in the U.S. Such understanding, it is to be hoped, may play a role in lessening the possibility of future conflict.

Finally, for what is worth, I am confident that, as a board member, I could work effectively and well with people from varying backgrounds and diverse points of view.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I am honored to have been nominated for this position. I thank you for the opportunity to appear here and express my views.

STATEMENT FOR COMPLETION BY PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES

PART I: ALL THE INFORMATION IN THIS PART WILL BE MADE PUBLIC

Name: Weinrod (last) W. (first) Bruce (middle)

Position to which nominated: Member of the Board of Directors of the U.S. Institute of Peace

Date of nomination: September 9, 1985

Date of birth: 7 (day) December (month) 1947 (year)

Place of birth: Washington, D.C.

Marital status: Single ;

Full name of spouse:

Name and ages of children:

Education:

Institution	Dates attended	Degrees received	Dates of degrees
Coolidge High School	1962-1965	High School	1965
Univ. of Texas	1965-1966		
American University	1966-1969	BA	1969
U. of Pennsylvania	1973-1973	MA	1973
Georgetown University	1974-1978	J.D.	1978

Honors and awards: List below all scholarships, fellowships, honorary degrees, military medals, honorary society memberships, and any other special recognitions for outstanding service or achievement.

Memberships: List below all memberships and offices held in professional, fraternal, business, scholarly, civic, charitable and other organizations for the last five years and any other prior memberships or offices you consider relevant.

Organization	Office held (if any)	Dates
Foreign Student Service Council	Board Member	1984 - Present
International Affairs Council	Board Member	1985 - Present
International Institute for Strategic Studies		1977- Present
The Philadelphia Society		1973 - Present
D.C. Bar		1978 - Present
American Council of Young Political Leaders	Representative to U.N. Community	1984 - Present

Employment record: List below all positions held since college, including the title or description of job, name of employer, location of work, and dates of inclusive employment.

7/82-present	The Heritage Foundation/Director of Foreign Policy and Defense Studies		Wash., D.C.
7/79-7/82	Sen. John Heinz	Legislative Director	Wash., D.C.
5/78-6/79	Chase Manhattan Bank	Manager, International Corporate Affairs	NYC, NY
2/78-3/78	Sen. Paul Laxalt	Advisor/Central America and International Law	Wash., D.C.
7/77-2/78	Self employed	Writing	Wash., D.C.
7/76-7/77	American Council of Young Political Leaders	Executive Director	Wash., D.C.
1/76-6/76	Self Employed	Writing	Wash., D.C.
6/74-12/75	Cong. Burt Talcott	Legislative Director	Wash., D.C.
3/74-6/74	Foreign Policy Research Institute	Foreign Policy Analyst	Phila., PA
2/72-12/72	White House	Writing and Research Staff	Wash., D.C.
7/69-2/72	U.S. Army	Medic	U.S./Panama Canal Zone

Government experience: List any advisory, consultative, honorary or other part-time service or positions with Federal, State, or local governments other than those listed above.

Published writings: List the titles, publishers and dates of books, articles, reports or other published materials you have written.

"The Canal and US-Panamanian Relations"	Orbis	Spring 1973
"Kissinger: Portrait of a Mind"	Academic Reviewer	Summer 1974
"Argentina: From Juan to Isabel Peron"	Orbis	Summer 1974
"Counterinsurgency: Its Role in Defense Policy"	Strategic Review	Fall 1974
"Is Korea the Next Vietnam?"	The American Spectator/Dec. 1976	
"The Neutrality Treaty: Are US Rights Protected?"	Heritage Foundation Backgrounder	March 1978
"The Future That Doesn't Work"	Academic Reviewer	Sp/Su 1978
"Curing the English Disease"	Journal of International Relations	Summer 1978

(continued on attached sheet #1)

Political affiliations and activities: List all memberships and offices held in or financial contributions and services rendered to all political parties or election committees during the last five years.

Registered Republican

Future employment relationships:

1. Indicate whether you will sever all connections with your present employer, business firm, association or organization if you are confirmed by the Senate.

NO

2. State whether you have any plans after completing government service to resume employment, affiliation or practice with your previous employer, business firm, association or organization.

Not Applicable

3. Has a commitment been made to you for employment after you leave Federal service?

Not Applicable

4. Do you intend to serve the full term for which you have been appointed or until the next Presidential election, whichever is applicable?

Yes

Potential conflicts of interest:

1. Describe any financial arrangements, deferred compensation agreements or other continuing financial, business or professional dealings with business associates, clients or customers who will be affected by policies which you will influence in the position to which you have been nominated.

None

2. List any investments, obligations, liabilities, or other financial relationships which constitute potential conflicts of interest with the position to which you have been nominated.

None

3. Describe any business relationship, dealing or financial transaction which you have had during the last five years whether for yourself, on behalf of a client, or acting as an agent, that constitutes a potential conflict of interest with the position to which you have been nominated.

None

4. List any lobbying activity during the past 10 years in which you have engaged for the purpose of directly or indirectly influencing the passage, defeat or modification of any Federal legislation or of affecting the administration and execution of Federal law or policy.

None

5. Explain how you will resolve any potential conflict of interest that may be disclosed by your responses to the above items.

Not Applicable

Kiera 13-919608

ALLEN WEINSTEIN: Biographical Summary

CURRENT ACTIVITIES: Allen Weinstein, 45, is University Professor at Georgetown U
versity and, at Georgetown's Center for Strategic and International Studies, h
the following positions: Executive Editor of *The Washington Quarterly*, Senior
Fellow for American Institutions and Values, and Executive Director of the CSI
bipartisan Congressional Policy Group in International Communications. In add
tion, he served as Vice-Chairman on the United States delegation to the UNESCO
World Conference on Cultural Policies held in Mexico City in the summer of 198
He is an elected member of the Society of American Historians, a member of the
eign Policy Association's Editorial Advisory Committee, and an editorial advis
to *The Wilson Quarterly*. At Georgetown University, he serves on the Graduate
search Council and the Select Committee on Institutes. He is teaching both in
History Department and the School of Foreign Service.

RECENT ACTIVITIES: Before coming to Georgetown, he served as a member of the Edi
Board of *The Washington Post* in 1981 and, from 1966-1981, as Professor of Hist
at Smith College, whose American Studies program he directed from 1971-77. In
he served also on the ACLS Fellowship Selection Committee for "Studies in Mode
Society and Values" and on the National Archivist's Advisory Group of scholars
administering FBI records. In January 1981, he delivered the annual Commonwea
Fund Lecture at the University of London, the only major endowed lectureship a
senior seminar for Americanists in England. During the 1981 season, he also c
ated and moderated Inside Washington, a weekly PBC public affairs television s
In 1980, he served as a Fellow of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for
Scholars at the Smithsonian.

He organized in 1980 and served as Coordinator of the Ad Hoc Citizens Committe
for the Madrid-Helsinki Review Meeting, an international non-governmental hum
rights group which sponsored a number of public events at the Madrid CSCE conf
ence. During the 1980 presidential campaign, though a Democrat, he served on
Reagan foreign policy advisory group and, after the election, supervised daily
activities for the International Communication Agency transition team while a
icy advisor for the National Security Transition Working Group. He traveled t
Nicaragua and El Salvador in the spring of 1982 as a member of the delegation
by The Committee to Protect Journalists.

From 1977-80, he directed The Twentieth Century Fund's "Project on Access and
vacy," which studied the Freedom of Information Act's impact upon intelligence
national security agencies. In this connection, he has served as a consultant
a number of historians' and archivists' groups, corporations, and government a
cies on questions of information policy, public diplomacy, international comm
tions, and human rights. He was also a founding member of the academic Consor
for the Study of Intelligence.

CURRENT PUBLICATIONS: The third edition of his co-authored book, *Freedom and Cri*
An American History (Random House), a leading college and university text, app
in 1981. Also published in 1981 was his edited collection, *Truman and the Fo*
of Israel: The 30th Anniversary Conference (the first of a series by the "Pro
on Contemporary American Affairs" which he helped to establish at the Hebrew U
versity's Harry S. Truman Research Institute).

An earlier book, *Perjury: The Hiss-Chambers Case*, earned a 1980 American Book
nomination, received an "Edgar" nomination in 1979 for non-fiction books by th
Mystery Writers of America, and received the 1979 National Intelligence Study

Center's award. Perjury was published in 1978 by Alfred A. Knopf in the United
States and Hutchinson's Ltd. in England, with a Vintage paperback appearing in
1979. Another of his books, Between the Wars: American Foreign Policy from Ver-
sailles to Pearl Harbor (Berkley paperback, 1979) accompanied Eric Sevareid's M
Oil television series on that theme. Also in 1979, he published the third edit
of his widely used co-edited collection, American Negro Slavery: A Modern Reade
(Oxford University Press).

WORK-IN-PROGRESS: He is now writing two books, one for Simon & Schuster, Labyrint
The Approach of War in FDR's Washington, 1940-1941, and one for Alfred A. Knopf
The Haunted Wood: Modern America and the Internal Security Issue, 1917-1960. H
is also preparing a television adaptation of Perjury: The Hiss-Chambers Case an
adapting Freedom and Crisis: An American History for use in university-level vi
courses in U.S. history.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES AND HONORS (other than those described in previous section
He served from 1977-79 as a member of the Editorial Board of The Journal of Ame
can Studies. He was a member (representing the American Historical Association
from 1974-77 of the Joint AHA-OAH-SAA Committee on Historians and Archives. In
1977, he was a National Endowment for the Humanities Fellow at the Hoover Insti
tion (Stanford) while also a visiting scholar at the Stanford Law School. He
received both an American Council of Learned Societies Fellowship and the Trum
Library annual grant in 1975. He served twice as Senior Fulbright Lecturer in
Australia, once in 1967 and again in 1971. He has spoken at dozens of scholarl
professional, and public forums in twelve countries and has served as a visitin
professor at Amherst College, Brown University, and Columbia University's Teach
College. He received his Ph.D. from Yale University in American Studies in 196
receiving Yale's Egleston Prize award in American History for his dissertation.
Also in 1967, he won the Organization of American Historians' prize for the bes
article in The Journal of American History. He began teaching at Smith College
1966 after two years spent as an instructor in history at the University of Mar
land (College Park).

PREVIOUS PUBLICATIONS: His articles have appeared in The American Scholar, The Am
can Historical Review, The Business History Review, Commentary, Encounter, Esqu
The Journal of American Studies, The Nation, The New Republic, The New York Rev
of Books, Revue des Langues Vivantes, TransAction and the following newspapers
(selective list only): The Dallas Times Herald, The International Herald Tribu
The Houston Chronicle, The Los Angeles Times, The New York Times (Op-Ed page, S
day Book Review, Sunday Magazine, News of the Week in Review), The Wall Street
Journal, The Washington Post (Book World, Editorial page, Op-Ed page), and The
Washington Star.

His previous books include Prelude to Populism: Origins of the Silver Issue (Ya
University Press, 1970), Origins of Modern America, 1865-1900 (Random House, 19
and the co-edited collections all published by Oxford University Press: The Seg
gation Era (1970), The Growth of American Politics, 2 vols. (1972), and America
Themes: Essays in Historiography (1968).

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONS FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

1. I have received no instructions from any source including the White House, the State Department, the Defense Department, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, concerning reauthorization of the Institute. I have not yet had the opportunity to see any Administration-proposed amendments to the statute authorizing the Institute.

2. As I stated in the full text of my testimony before the Committee, which was submitted for the record, "I think it would be a mistake to have too firm a set of views on the Institute and its activities at this early point." Should my nomination be approved by the Senate, I would want to take a considerable amount of my own time to review all of the activities mentioned in Question #2 in order to determine in my own mind the relative priorities among competing alternatives. In my statement to the Committee, I do outline a number of general principles which would guide my approach to this matter, as well as the general kinds of sources of information which I would want to take advantage of as I considered these questions.

3. Again, I think it is too early in my own thinking to state in a very specific way the kinds of symposia and training programs that I would want to support. At the same time, as I did mention in my remarks to the Committee, I do very much endorse the thought offered by Senator Matsunaga that not only current leaders but potential leaders, that is younger people who are likely to be leaders in the years ahead, should be participants in at least some of the activities sponsored or funded by the Institute.

4. At this point I do not have any specific ideas on what kinds of grants to fund peace education might be most useful and effective. Again, I would want to review thoughts and suggestions made by various parties and institutions which might be interested in receiving such grants, as well as other interested parties before making any final decisions.

5. I have had no direct involvement with the United States Institute of Peace prior to my nomination for its Board. In its earliest history, I was not involved in the public policy process. More recently, as can be seen from the background information supplied to the Committee, I was employed either in the private sector or on Capitol Hill for a substantial portion of this period.

6. As a Director of the Institute, I would naturally be very concerned about the preservations of its independence, reputation and credibility, and I would not want to see these compromised for any reason. As I stated in my remarks to the Committee, I do not believe that the Institute should be involved in a direct way in the political or policy process of the United States government, and I would, therefore, oppose any activities by the Institute that would involve it direccly with the policy process whether it be in the intelligence field or any other area. In any directives issued by the Board to guide the operation of the Institute, I believe this restriction should be made clear.

7. As I stated in my testimony to the Committee "the Institute should not be involved in a direct way in the policy of political process." I would certainly support the adoption of guidelines for the Institute which make clear that it should not be directly involved in the policy process. In my review of any specific projects or proposals that the Board should have to approve, I would not support any proposals that would involve the Institute directly in the policy making process.

8. I do not have a detailed listing of specific programs and projects that I would like the Institute to undertake. In any

event, any specific ideas which I might have would have to be considered and approved by the Institute's Board. Decisions will also have to be made as to the allocation of resources among the three areas listed in this question. It is impossible for me to state what my priorities would be in the allocation of resources among these three areas until I have a better idea of the specific programs which might be undertaken in each area. In my prepared testimony, I tried to cover in detail the general principles that I would follow in trying to determine priorities for the activities of the Institute and let me refer to them again here:

-I would want to begin with an overall review of the background of the creation of the Institute. As former Senator Jennings Randolph put it: "the proper beginning ... requires an appreciation of the history of the ideas and particularly of the themes which have marked the legislative debate ..."

-the focus of the Institute's activities should be primarily on non-military approaches to conflicts which affect the nation's security and well-being.

-the primary functions of the Institute should be in the areas of research, compiling information and encouraging meetings and conferences.

-the Institute's efforts should ensure that diverse viewpoints are represented.

-the Institute should not be involved in a direct way in the policy or political process.

-the Institute should be non-partisan in its activities.

-the Institute should conduct its activities in a fiscally responsible manner.

-the Institute should develop a center for the short-term residence of scholars and others with relevant backgrounds and expertise. Such residents should be required to produce very specific work during their stay at the center.

-the Institute should consider ways in which its activities and output can involve, and be made available to, the non-expert as well as the expert.

-the Institute should among other things act as a catalyst for existing institutions and programs.

-the Institute should seek to utilize traditional disciplines such as history and classical political philosophy, as well as the insight of important religious traditions, as well as more contemporary approaches such as quantitative analysis.

9. As I stated in my statement to the Committee "the Institute should consider ways in which its activities and output can involve, and be made available to, the non-expert as well as the expert." As a Board member, I would make clear my view that the programs and the activities of the Institution be developed in such a way that the non-expert can benefit from the activities

underaken. Certain activities may well be appropriate only for specialists, but even in these cases, the results of of their discussions can be dissemanated in a way that it is accessable to the non-expert or non-specialist. For the past twelve years, I have been working with an international exchange organization which is designed primarily to give non-experts a better understanding of important international issues. I will apply my experience gained in these activities to my assessment of the best ways in which the Institute's activities can be made available to the non-expert audience.

Senator **Stafford**. Thank you, Mr. Weinrod. Since you didn't use all of your 5 minutes, I will comment, as an addendum, that I notice in your prepared statement you have been chairman of a U.S. delegation in the Soviet-American Conference at Middlebury College in Middlebury, VT. Since that is near my home and I am a graduate of that institution, that has scored one large plus for you as far as the Chairman of this meeting is concerned.

Mr. **Weinrod**. That was totally unintended, of course.

Senator **Stafford**. Mr. Lovett of Hartford, CT—I guess that's West Hartford—we would be very happy to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF SIDNEY LOVETT OF WEST HARTFORD, CT

Mr. **Lovett**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Matsunaga, Senator Randolph, I am very pleased to have been nominated for this position on the Board. I am also very pleased with the commentary that my fellow colleagues on the Board have offered in terms of where they are coming from.

I come from a slightly different tradition. I have served as pastor of large parishes in different regions of the United States. I come from the Congregational tradition of New England, but our denomination, the United Church of Christ, has supported the proposition that there should be a U.S. Institute of Peace, having voted at its general synod. I have been blessed as a pastor of a parish for 10 years in the Washington area to have had Milton "Mike" Mapes as a parishioner as well as a childhood friend. His last effort was to bring this Institute into being as executive director, National Peace Academy Campaign. I supported this goal financially and with such counsel as was sought.

I come from a tradition that has been an institute-builder, building colleges and universities, health institutions, and concerned for social justice and for the process toward peace.

I am pleased to have an opportunity to serve in that latter regard, and am grateful to be before this committee this morning. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Lovett, his biographical sketch, and responses to questions submitted to him follow:]

STATEMENT OF THE REVEREND SIDNEY LOVETT
BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES
SENATOR ROBERT T. STAFFORD, CHAIR
OCTOBER 24, 1985

Mr. Chairman, my name is Sidney Lovett. I am an ordained minister of the United Church of Christ, currently serving as Senior Minister of the First Church of Christ, Congregational, in West Hartford, Connecticut.

I graduated from Yale in 1950 (B.A. History-Economics/Political Science) and from Union Theological Seminary, New York City, in 1953 (M.Div. Christian Ethics).

With the exception of three years service as Conference Minister (1973-76) of the Central Atlantic Conference UCC, headquartered in the Washington area, it has been my privilege to serve as Pastor to congregations located in Massachusetts, Virginia, Illinois and for nine years in West Hartford.

The tradition in which I serve gives priority to the values of covenant faith, global stewardship, justice and the search for peace. The tradition also has a history of creating institutions which seek to achieve these goals (e.g. colleges and universities, health care institutions, overseas ministries, etc.). Consequently, while pastoral service has a parochial character of relating to persons in the context of their place and personal circumstances, each congregation is aware that it can only fulfill its stewardship by including the global issues and needs with its responsibilities. ("The Philanthropy of Organized Religion", published by the Council on Foundations)

While my formal educational training featured the appropriate subject material pertinent to the goals and charter of the U.S. Institute of Peace, it was the generosity and integrity of parishioners of the Rock Spring Congregational Church in Arlington, Virginia, which introduced me to the pragmatic world of ideals, hopes and loyalties set in a context of limited choices and complex processes. For almost 10 years (1957-66) these mentors from all quarters of government service permitted me to live in the context of their vocations. I, in turn, was encouraged to offer leadership in such areas as Civil Rights in Arlington, Virginia; meetings between national religious leaders and the White House staff; training/education programs for U.S.D.A. Graduate School; etc.

One distinguished member of that Arlington congregation was the late Milton "Mike" Mapes, a personal friend since childhood. As he entered what was to be his final life's endeavor as Executive Director, National Peace Academy Campaign, he encouraged all whom he knew and met to become familiar with the goals of creating what is now the U.S. Institute of Peace. I supported this goal both financially and with such counsel as was sought. My denomination, the United Church of Christ, voted (via the General Synod) to endorse this goal and there is wide support throughout the main line Protestant denominations as well as the U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops (Pastoral Letter May 3, 1983, III 229).

I would hope to assist in fulfilling the hopes of Mike Mapes and more importantly/implement the rising energies and aspirations of the religious and secular communities for an outstanding institute representing our nation's commitment to intiate collegial leadership in promoting research, resource sharing and training opportunities in peacemaking and conflict resolution.

I believe that my experience in creating, maintaining and directing institutions would be of pertinent assistance (Trustee and Executive Committee of two graduate schools - Chicago Theological Seminary and Hartford, Connecticut Seminary and more recently, 1975-present, Director (President, 1980-82) of the Alban Institute, Washington, DC).

One of the most salutary developments in an age of increased violence is the energetic response of academicians and practitioners to the art and science of peacemaking. More curricula, symposia, "case study" reporting is available than ever before (see Peace and World Order Studies, Fourth Edition, 1984, Curriculum Guide) - newspapers report of new styles and responsibilities in settling disputes (N.Y. TIMES 10/22/85, "Negotiators in Demand, p. D-28).

The contemporary vision of peace, nourished by faith or by pragmatic, "hard nosed" necessity, or both, has a potential new emergence in U.S.I.P. . "For something to be attempted, it is first necessary to have the vision that it can be achieved"(Norman Cousins). I am pleased to have the opportunity to be considered for such an assignment and will attempt to fulfill it to the best of my ability.

Sidney Lovett

Statement of the Rev. Sidney Lovett before the
U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources,
Senator Robert T. Stafford, Chair, Oct. 24, 1985

STATEMENT FOR COMPLETION BY PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES

PART I: ALL THE INFORMATION IN THIS PART WILL BE MADE PUBLIC

Name: Lovett (LAST) Sidney (FIRST) (nmi) (OTHER)

Position to which nominated: Director, U.S. Institute of Peace **Date of nomination:**

Date of birth: 1 (DAY) May (MONTH) 1928 (YEAR) **Place of birth:** Boston, Massachusetts

Marital status: Married **Full name of spouse:** Joan Campbell Lovett

Name and ages of children:
Katherine Lovett Weymouth 32
Margaret K. Lovett 31
J. C. Campbell Lovett 29
Elizabeth P. Lovett 26
Peter A. Lovett 25

Education:

Institution	Dates attended	Degrees received	Dates of degrees
Yale University	1946-'50	B.A.	1950
Union Theological Sem. N.Y.C.	1950-'53	M.Div.	1953

Honors and awards: List below all scholarships, fellowships, honorary degrees, military medals, honorary society memberships, and any other special recognitions for outstanding service or achievement.

Distinguished Service Award – West Side Organization
Chicago, Illinois 1973

Memberships: List below all memberships and offices held in professional, fraternal, business, scholarly, civic, charitable and other organizations for the last five years and any other prior memberships or offices you consider relevant.

Organization	Office held (if any)	Dates
Alban Institute, Washington, DC	Director 1975–Present President 1980–83	
Duncaster Inc, Bloomfield CT	Director	1980–85
Hartford Seminary	Director	1980–82
Advisors Unlimited Inc	President	1985 —
Foodshare Commission of Greater Hartford	Director	1982 —
N.E. Regional Advisory Council	President	1979–83
Arlington Council on Human Relations	President	1958–63
Community Renewal Society	Director, V.P.	1966–73

Employment record: List below all positions held since college, including the title or description of job, name of employer, location of work, and dates of inclusive employment.

(Part time (Summers of '51, '52) while a Seminary Student,
(Pastor, Mount Washington Congregational Church, Mount Wa Ma
7/53 – 4/57 Pastor, First Congregational Church,
Littleton, Mass.
5/57 – 6/66 Pastor, Rock Spring Congregational Church
Arlington, Virginia
9/66 – 10/73 Senior Minister, Union Church of Hinsdale
Hinsdale, Illinois
10/73 – 6/76 Conference Minister, Central Atlantic
Conference, U.C.C. Silver Spring Md.
7/76 – Present Senior Minister, First Church of Christ
Congregational, West Hartford, CT.

Government experience: List any advisory, consultative, honorary or other part-time service or positions with Federal, State, or local governments other than those listed above.

Member, Departmental Committee on the Social Sciences,
Graduate School, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture – 196

Published writings: List the titles, publishers and dates of books, articles, reports or other published materials you have written.

Housing Patterns in Arlington County, Virginia
U.S. Civil Rights Commission, National Capital Area, 196

Devotions, The Upper Room, 1973–74
Selected Sermons, Seabury Press 1973, '74, '75, '76

Chapter 8 "Summers in Holderness N.H." in Under Side of Yale
Publ. Yale Alumni Fund 1981

Political affiliations and activities: List all memberships and offices held in or financial contributions and services rendered to all political parties or election committees during the last five years.

1980 Contributed $100 John Glenn Cpgn; $50 to George Bush Ct.
1982 Cutler for Congress $100
1982 – Contributed $100 to Democratic National Campaign.
1983 Contributed $35 to D.S.G. Campaign Fund Ctte.
" Contributed $30 to Miriam Butterworth Cong. Campaign (Dem) West Hartford Ct.
Currently registered as a Democrat in West Hartford Ct

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Future employment relationships:

1. Indicate whether you will sever all connections with your present employer, business firm, association or organization if you are confirmed by the Senate.

No - by reason of serving as a Director (not employe

2. State whether you have any plans after completing government service to resume employment, affiliation or practice with your previous employer, business firm, association or organization.

(See above)

3. Has a commitment been made to you for employment after you leave Federal service?

No

4. Do you intend to serve the full term for which you have been appointed or until the next Presidential election, whichever is applicable?

Yes

Potential conflicts of interest:

1. Describe any financial arrangements, deferred compensation agreements or other continuing financial, business or professional dealings with business associates, clients or customers who will be affected by policies which you will influence in the position to which you have been nominated.

None

2. List any investments, obligations, liabilities, or other financial relationships which constitute potential conflicts of interest with the position to which you have been nominated.

None

3. Describe any business relationship, dealing or financial transaction which you have had during the last five years whether for yourself, on behalf of a client, or acting as an agent, that constitutes a potential conflict of interest with the position to which you have been nominated.

None

4. List any lobbying activity during the past 10 years in which you have engaged for the purpose of directly or indirectly influencing the passage, defeat or modification of any Federal legislation or of affecting the administration and execution of Federal law or policy.

None

5. Explain how you will resolve any potential conflict of interest that may be disclosed by your responses to the above items.

Promptly and in compliance with the Law
or Legislation.

November 6, 1985

To the Committee on Labor and Human Resources
United States Senate

From: Sidney Lovett

In response to questions to candidates to the Board of Directors to the United States Institute op Peace:

1. I have received no instructions from anyone concerning the authorization of the Institute and I am not familiar with the administration's proposed amendments.

2. In addition to its own organization as a board of directors and exploring the process of establishing priorities, my personal opinion at the moment would be to concentrate on researching the current levels of academic and institutional activity in the area of peacemaking and conflict resolution including the feasibility of a Data Bank. In my judgment, this surely precedes decisions regarding funding as well as information services. This would also undergird the selection of education and training at the graduate and postgraduate levels. In brief, the first six months ought to be utilized in the most active survey of existing resources together with the organization of the board and its policies. During the first year the attention should be given to establishing the Jennings Randolph Center, develop information services, and commencing both research and teaching options.

3. The Peace and World Order Studies for Education - 1984 curriculum guides - reveals that there are an increasing number of opportunities for study throughout the country. One possible area for symposia would be to conduct regional conferences for the purpose of assisting institutions currently active to meet together and share "words in progress" thinking. I would also want to propose that training programs be offered through the Defense University and other government agencies for the purpose of presenting a current range of creative options in conflict resolution; for example, the Harvard Negotiating Project with Roger Fisher. The purpose of such programs would be to assist the highest levels of federal service to fully inform about current experience and knowledge. It would also introduce the Institute of Peace as a resource for further consultation.

4. Clearly much research is currently underway throughout the United States. The board will presumably establish criteria for funding. The criteria would include a value judgment regarding the use of grant monies. The diversity among the members of the board would assist in making grants to the most worthwhile and productive options.

5. My involvement with the United States Institute of Peace began from a long friendship with Milton "Mike" Mapes, the late Executive Director, National Peace Academy Campaign. His enthusiasm led me to make modest personal contributions together with financial support from congregations where I have served as pastor. On several occasions, Mr. Mapes shared his concerns

about the difficulties in establishing the United States Institute of Peace and asked my advice.

6. A director, in accepting the office, swears to uphold the charter of the institute which clearly defines its independence and assumes a fiduciary relationship to maintain the institute's reputation against either covert or overt abuses. I accept that responsibility and trust that my fellow board members, together with an outstanding executive, can fulfill our responsibilities and meet the highest standards.

7. The enabling legislation makes it very clear that the Institute is not to be involved in making or encouraging United States foreign policy. Any director is obligated to examine the agenda of the board and staff to see that this mandate is complied with. I accept that responsibility.

8. After the initial research concening the state of the art and state of the institution is complete, the Institute can set priorities regarding research grants and the manner in which it wishes to present its educational, training and research materials. It seems clear at the moment that there is no federal coordinating center for the promotion of this dimension of knowledge and experience. The Institute has a rare opportunity to provide the incentive for regional sharing, whether it be via satellite branches or some other device. It can set some high standards, encourage collegial sharing, and promote wide participation in the art and science of peacemaking.

9. Emphasizing diversity of programs, responsive information service, and a systematic awareness of other resources throughout the land would be the best method for ensuring a broad public constituency.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Reverend Lovett. Reverend Neuhaus, we would be pleased to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD NEUHAUS OF NEW YORK, NY

Mr. NEUHAUS. Thank you, Senator Stafford, Senator Hatfield, Senator Matsunaga, Senator Randolph.

I don't know how many members you have in the Calvin Coolidge Club at present, but I think you've just added eight, if your criteria still stand, Senator Stafford—and I will try not to disqualify myself.

I've been for 20 years or more involved in various ways at the activist level and the collegial level, academic, publishing, writing altogether too much, I'm sure, in the form of books and articles over those years on ethics, public policy, with a particular interest in peace and international affairs.

I am very enthusiastic about the opportunity to be part of what I take to be an experiment of high promise. None of us knows what the Institute will be, but we all, as I think is evident from what has been said so far, have some rather compelling ideas and hopes of what it might be.

And I certainly join in all that Dr. Moore, the Chairman-designate, and others here have said.

My particular hope is that the full range of the churches and synagogues, voluntary organizations with which this Nation is so vibrantly endowed, will be very much engaged in the work of the Institute.

And I am sure, along with others, we will be trying to assure that that is the case, and, as a consequence, that we will have an Institute that will inform and discover and clarify and generally elevate the level of discourse about what it means to live in a world of peace with freedom and justice.

Thank you.

[The biographical sketch and responses of Mr. Neuhaus to questions submitted to him follows:]

STATEMENT FOR COMPLETION BY PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES

PART I: ALL THE INFORMATION IN THIS PART WILL BE MADE PUBLIC

Name: NEUHAUS (Last) RICHARD (First) JOHN (Other)

Position to which nominated: BOARD MEMBER, PEACE INST.

Date of nomination: AUGUST 1985

Date of birth: 14 (Day) MAY (Month) 36 (Year)

Place of birth: PEMBROKE, ONT., CANADA

Marital status: SINGLE

Full name of spouse:

Name and ages of children:

Education:

Institution	Dates attended	Degrees received	Dates of degrees
CONCORDIA COLLEGE	1952-55	B.A.	1955
CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY	1955-1960	M.DIV.	1960

Honors and awards: List below all scholarships, fellowships, honorary degrees, military medals, honorary society memberships, and any other special recognitions for outstanding service or achievement.

CATHOLIC PRESS AWARD 1967

JOHN PAUL II HUMAN RIGHTS AWARD 1983

DOCTOR OF LAWS, GONZAGA UNIVERSITY 1985

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AWARD 1984

Memberships: List below all memberships and offices held in professional, fraternal, business, scholarly, civic, charitable and other organizations for the last five years and any other prior memberships or offices you consider relevant.

Organization	Office held (If any)	Dates
ETHICS AND PUBLIC POLICY CENTER	BOARD MEMBER	1981 -
BREAD FOR THE WORLD	BOARD MEMBER	1976 - 85
SOCIETY OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS	MEMBER	1972 -
CLERGY AND LAITY CONCERNED	BOARD MEMBER	1965-72
INSTITUTE ON RELIGION AND DEMOCRACY	BOARD MEMBER	1981 -

Employment record: List below all positions held since college, including the title or description of job, name of employer, location of work, and dates of inclusive employment.

ST PAUL'S LUTHERAN CHURCH, MASSENA NY, PASTOR 1960 - 61; ST JOHN THE EVANGELIST, BROOKLYN, NY, PASTOR, 1961-77; SENIOR EDITOR, WORLDVIEW, THE COUNCIL ON RELIGION AND INT'L AFFAIRS, NY, 1972 - 84; CENTER ON RELIGION AND SOCIETY, NY, 1984 - PRESENT, DIRECTOR.

Government experience: List any advisory, consultative, honorary or other part-time service or positions with Federal, State, or local governments other than those listed above.

PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTEE, WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE
ON FAMILIES.
ETHICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE, USIA
CHAIRMAN, COMMUNITY PLANNING BOARD, NYC

Published writings: List the titles, publishers and dates of books, articles, reports or other published materials you have written.

IN DEFENSE OF PEOPLE (MACMILLAN) 1971
MOVEMENT AND REVOLUTION (DOUBLEDAY) 1969
TIME TOWARD HOME (SEABURY) 1976
FREEDOM FOR MINISTRY (HARPER & ROW) 1979
CHRISTIAN FAITH AND PUBLIC POLICY (AUGSBURG) 1975
THE NAKED PUBLIC SQUARE (EERDMANS) 1984
NUMEROUS ARTICLES IN WORLDVIEW, CHRISTIAN CENTURY,
COMMONWEAL, COMMENTARY et al.

Political affiliations and activities: List all memberships and offices held in or financial contributions and services rendered to all political parties or election committees during the last five years.

NONE

Future employment relationships:

1. Indicate whether you will sever all connections with your present employer, business firm, association or organization if you are confirmed by the Senate.

NO, PART-TIME APPOINTMENT

2. State whether you have any plans after completing government service to resume employment, affiliation or practice with your previous employer, business firm, association or organization.

SEE ABOVE

3. Has a commitment been made to you for employment after you leave Federal service?

SEE ABOVE

4. Do you intend to serve the full term for which you have been appointed or until the next Presidential election, whichever is applicable?

YES

Potential conflicts of interest:

1. Describe any financial arrangements, deferred compensation agreements or other continuing financial, business or professional dealings with business associates, clients or customers who will be affected by policies which you will influence in the position to which you have been nominated.

NONE

2. List any investments, obligations, liabilities, or other financial relationships which constitute potential conflicts of interest with the position to which you have been nominated.

NONE

3. Describe any business relationship, dealing or financial transaction which you have had during the last five years whether for yourself, on behalf of a client, or acting as an agent, that constitutes a potential conflict of interest with the position to which you have been nominated.

NONE

4. List any lobbying activity during the past 10 years in which you have engaged for the purpose of directly or indirectly influencing the passage, defeat or modification of any Federal legislation or of affecting the administration and execution of Federal law or policy.

-SUPPORT FOR THE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA
OF BREAD FOR THE WORLD
- SUPPORT FOR PRO-LIFE LEGISLATION
ON ABORTION

5. Explain how you will resolve any potential conflict of interest that may be disclosed by your responses to the above items.

NOT APPLICABLE

QUESTIONS FOR CANDIDATES FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

1. Have you received any instructions from the White House, the State Department, the Defense Department or the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency concerning reauthorization of the Institute? Are you familiar with the Administration-proposed amendments to the Institute and if so, what is your position?
2. The U. S. Institute of Peace Act authorizes the Institute to carry out a number of activities including research of its own, the funding of research at other institutions, education and training at the graduate and post-graduate levels continuing education, information services, and the Jennings Randolph Center for International Peace. Which of these activities do you think should receive priority during the next six months? During the next year?
3. What sort of symposia and training programs will you initiate, and for whom, and to what purpose?
4. Do you have any ideas on how you might use grants to fund peace education?
5. What involvement, if any have you had with the United States Institute of Peace prior to your nomination for its Board--during the long legislative history, and through your publications or speeches?
6. What will you do to ensure that the Institute's independence, reputation, or credibility is not compromised by covert intelligence action, any misuse of the Institute's potential access to classified materials or association with the various intelligence agencies?
7. This Committee has emphasized that the Institute is not to make U. S. foreign policy or to implement it. What will you do to ensure that it does not perform a policy making or implementation role?
8. It has been this Committee's intent that the Institute develop its own programs, courses, publications and public educational activities, that the Institute provide grants to existing institutions to strengthen and expand their programs, and that the Institute establish a series of satellite branches across the nation. What is your intention to develop the Institute along these lines?
9. What will you do to ensure that the public may fully participate in the Institute's programs, rather than creating or catering to an elite of specialists?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE ROCKFORD INSTITUTE—NEW YORK

THE CENTER ON
RELIGION & SOCIETY

Mr. Ronald F. Docksai
United States Senate
Committee on Labor and
Human Resources
Washington, D.C. 20510
12 November 85

Dear Mr. Docksai,

The transcript of my testimony which you enclosed is quite satisfactory.

Following are responses to the questions whicn you enclosed:

1. I have received no such instructions. And I am not clear what is referred to by "Administration-proposed amendments," so I expect the proper response is that I am not familiar with them.

2. In the first year it may be wise for the Institute to focus on research at other institutions, disseminating information, and developing the Randolph Center. On these and other questions I would, of course, want to take into account the thinking of other board members. But it does seem that in the first year the program will not be entirely "up to speed," and we should therefore do what can be done well immediately.

3. As I indicated in my testimony, I think it especially important that we include the widest variety of churches, conflict resolution groups, voluntary organizations, and other "mediating structures" in such symposia and training programs. While being of assistance to the Government in various ways, it is a large part of the genius of the Institute, as I understand it, to lift up and strengthen non-governmental efforts toward peace.

4. Research grants should insist on impeccable and non-partisan academic and other resources. General peace education grants should take a careful look at the organization's track record for elevating the level of public understanding, rather than merely pushing one line of "solution" for the reality of conflicts.

5. Over the years I have pointed to the Peace Institute (Academy) as an idea of either terrible naivete or high promise, depending on how it is conceived. From the immediate legislative history, and the legislation itself, I draw the conclusion that it is a venture of high promise indeed.

152 MADISON AVENUE (24th FLOOR) • NEW YORK • NEW YORK • 10016
PHONE (212) 532-4320

6. This is clearly a question of great importance. I confess that the mechanics of ensuring such security is a subject on which I have no proposals at present. But this must certainly be a matter of high priority in the early deliberations of the board.

7. It would defeat the entire idea of the Institute were it to try to involve itself in making or implementing foreign policy, and I would vigorously oppose any such effort.

8. It would be premature to respond in detail, except to say that I am in full accord with the Committee's intent and will strive to see that it is fulfilled.

9. Please see my response to question # 3 above.

I trust these comments are helpful and stand ready to supply any further information that may be required.

Sincerely,

Richard John Neuhaus
Director

Senator **Stafford**. Thank you, Reverend Neuhaus. Dr. Weinstein, we are ready for you.

STATEMENT OF ALLEN WEINSTEIN OF WASHINGTON, DC

Dr. **Weinstein**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a very close 80-year-old relative in Vermont, who much admires the chairman. [Laughter.]

I've got to keep my mind on your 5-minute rule, or I don't think I could go up there for awhile.

Senator **Stafford**. I'm delighted to hear about the Vermont connection, and since we have been establishing those all morning, I will say to the Reverend Lovett that I am a member of his church in Rutland, VT.

Dr. **Weinstein**. Well, in my relative's day the Calvin Coolidge Society which you mentioned had a 1-minute limit, you see, Mr. Chairman, but I guess times have become more liberal.

Mr. Chairman, Senator Hatfield, Senator Matsunaga, Senator Pell, Senator Randolph, it is an honor to appear before you today as a Presidential nominee for this Board, the Board of Directors of the U.S. Institute of Peace, an initiative whose time has come.

All of us designated for the tasks assigned to the new Institute by the legislation that created it must ask ourselves: Are we capable of dedicating ourselves to the task at hand, one so crisply but wisely described by the psalmist: to seek peace and pursue it.

Recalling, however, the philosopher Spinoza's injunction that peace is not alone, not simply an absence of war, it is a virtue, a state of mind, a disposition for benevolence, confidence, justice.

In my own case, I can assure the members of this committee that should I be confirmed by the Senate in this post, I will devote my energies on the Board to assuring that the bipartisan mandate of this Congress in creating the Institute is fulfilled successfully.

I would like to briefly mention a few elements in my own background which relate to a continuing concern for problems of arms control, conflict resolution, and the achievement of peace.

First, various of my books and articles in the fields of U.S. history indicate such an interest within its historical context—and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has a list of those writings among the material submitted.

Second, as editor of two publications, the Washington Quarterly and the Center magazine, I published articles and conference transcripts, some of them by your own colleagues in the U.S. Senate, related to arms control and conflict resolution issues on a regular basis.

Third, while serving last year as president of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, I revived my predecessor's, Robert Maynard Hutchins, earlier tradition of Pacem in Terras conferences on global conflict and arms control issues, which in our November 1984 version held at Georgetown University and televised nationally by C-span brought together a divergent group of distinguished experts to assess the theme: Democracy and the Prospects for a Peaceful, Humane World.

Fourth, also while president of the Hutchins Center, working on a bipartisan basis with Members of the U.S. Congress, we brought together leaders of the Salvadoran Government, guerrilla opposition and rightist opposition, for a unique nationally televised debate in Los Angeles on the issues of the civil war in that country. Preparations for that debate preceded the opening of the La Palma dialog by months.

Fifth, for the past several years I have had the privilege of working closely with leaders of Congress from both parties and other political leaders on a bipartisan basis to help further democratic initiatives in other countries, and, in some instances, in our own country.

Finally, sixth, as acting president of the National Endowment for Democracy, working closely with its chairman, Congressman Dante Fascell, and other Board members, I assisted in the process of establishing a new institution, bylaws, staff search procedures, guidelines for grants, and similar details, and I hope that experience will prove of some use in our current enterprise.

And, Mr. Chairman, I would like to simply interject that our Chairman, John Norton Moore, is a superb choice for the person to guide us through this process. It's a privilege to work with him.

I will close, Mr. Chairman, by recalling a comment made by Senator Hatfield, the cochairman, while introducing the amendment on June 20, 1984, which led to today's confirmation hearing. "The individuals, institutions, and Members of Congress who share the dream of a peace institute," he said, "deserve an opportunity to make that dream a reality."

Now that the Peace Institute has become a reality, Mr. Chairman, not only those same individuals and groups, but the American people, are entitled to the most effective institute that members of its Board and staff can develop.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I pray that I kept within that 5-minute limit.

[The biographical sketch of Dr. Weinstein and responses to questions submitted to him follow:]

STATEMENT FOR COMPLETION BY PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES

PART I: ALL THE INFORMATION IN THIS PART WILL BE MADE PUBLIC

Name: Weinstein, (last) Allen (first) --- (other)

Position to which nominated: Member, Board of Directors, United States Institute of Peace **Date of nomination:** Oct. 8, 1985

Date of birth: 1 (day) 9 (month) 37 (year) **Place of birth:** New York City

Marital status: Married **Full name of spouse:** Diane Gilbert Weinstein

Name and ages of children:
Andrew Samuel, 15
David Meier, 13

Education:

Institution	Dates attended	Degrees received	Dates of degrees
Yale University	1960-63	Ph.D. M.A.	1967 1962
The City College (NY)	1954, 1959-60	B.A.	1960
Columbia College (NY)	1954-57	---	

Honors and awards: List below all scholarships, fellowships, honorary degrees, military medals, honorary society memberships, and any other special recognitions for outstanding service or achievement.

(partial list-
a full list
is appended
to this page
as page 2 of
my basic
curriculum vitae)

Commonwealth Fund Lecturer, University of London, 1981
Fellow, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 1980
Elected Member, The Society of American Historians, 1982--
Senior Fulbright Lecturer, Australia, 1968 and 1971-72
American Council of Learned Societies Fellow, 1975
Harry S. Truman Library Institute Annual Award, 1974-75
National Endowment for the Humanities Fellow & National Fellow, The Hoover Institution, Stanford University, 1977

(list continued on the appended page 2 of my c.v.)

Memberships: List below all memberships and offices held in professional, fraternal, business, scholarly, civic, charitable and other organizations for the last five years and any other prior memberships or offices you consider relevant.

Organization	Office held (if any)	Dates
Society of American Historians	--	1982--present
Foreign Policy Assn.,	Editorial Advisory Bd.,	1982--present
Committee for a Community of Democracies./	Board member	1984-present
Humanities Foundation, Boston University		1985--
Graduate Research Council, Georgetown U.		1983-85
American Council of Learned Societies' Fellowship Selection Committee		1981
National Archivist's Scholars' Advisory group on Administering FBI Records		1981-82

Employment record: List below all positions held since college, including the title or description of job, name of employer, location of work, and dates of inclusive employment.

1/85-present: Boston University, Boston, Mass.--President, The Center for Democracy, University Professor, & Professor of History

3/84-12/84: University of California/Santa Barbara--President, The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Adjunct Professor of History, Adjunct Professor of Political Science; Editor, The Center Magazine

1/84-3/84: The National Endowment for Democracy, Washington, D.C.--Acting President

11/81-1/84: Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.--UniversityProfessor (in History), Editor, The Washington Quarterly, Center for Strategic & International Studies

1/81-10/81: The Washington Post, Washington, D.C., Member, Editorial Page Staff

9/66-6/81: Smith College, Northampton, Mass.--Professor of History (for the last eightyears, from '73-'81) & Director of American Studies (periodically)

9/64-6/66: University of Maryland, College Park, Md.--Lecturer in History

6/61-8/61: Carnegie Foundation Teaching Fellow, The City College (NY)

Government experience: List any advisory, consultative, honorary or other part-time service or positions with Federal, State, or local governments other than those listed above.

Vice Chairman, United States delegation to the UNESCO International Program for the Development of Communication (IPDC) meeting, Tashkent, U.S.S.R., 9/83

Vice Chairman and Coordinator, United States delegation to the UNESCO World Conference on Cultural Policy, Mexico City, Mexico, 7/82-8/82

Published writings: List the titles, publishers and dates of books, articles, reports or other published materials you have written.

Freedom and Crisis: An American History (4th ed. in preparation; Editions 1-3, Random House, 1974, 1978, 1981)

Harry S. Truman & the Founding of Israel (Hebrew U.Press, '81

Perjury: The Hiss Chambers Case (Knopf; Vintage paperback, Hutchinson Ltd.--UK; 1978-79)

Between the Wars: American Foreign Policy from Versailles to Pearl Harbor (Berkley paperback, 1978)

Prelude to Populism: Origins of the Silver Issue (Yale U. Press, '70

American Negro Slavery: A Modern Reader (4th ed., 1985, Oxford University Press)

The Growth of American Politics, 2 vols. (Oxford University Press, 1972--both this and ANS co-edited collections)

(A complete list of my books and articles can be found on pages 4-6 of the accompanying curriculum vitae)

Political affiliations and activities: List all memberships and offices held in or financial contributions and services rendered to all political parties or election committees during the last five years.

I have worked with the Chairmen and other leading officials of both the Democratic and Republican National Committees on a range of bipartisan programs, mainly international, since 1983, within the following organizations: The Democracy Program (whose report proposed The National Endowment for Democracy) of which I was Study Director; The National Endowment for Democracy (Acting President), the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, and-currently-The Center for Democracy of Boston University.

6/80-9/80: Governor Reagan's Foreign Policy Advisory Group (mainly presented suggestions on international communications policy--USIA, VOA, BIB)

Future employment relationships:

1. Indicate whether you will sever all connections with your present employer, business firm, association or organization if you are confirmed by the Senate.

No. It is my understanding that membership on the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace does not require this.

2. State whether you have any plans after completing government service to resume employment, affiliation or practice with your previous employer, business firm, association or organization.

Not appicable, I think, to my prospective role as Board member.

3. Has a commitment been made to you for employment after you leave Federal service?

----

4. Do you intend to serve the full term for which you have been appointed or until the next Presidential election, whichever is applicable?

I intend to serve the full term.

Potential conflicts of interest:

1. Describe any financial arrangements, deferred compensation agreements or other continuing financial, business or professional dealings with business associates, clients or customers who will be affected by policies which you will influence in the position to which you have been nominated.

I cannot conceive of any major conflicts of interest except, of course, I would urge all members of the Board to join me in adopting stringent guidelines to preclude their assisting applications from groups or institutions with which they have been affiliated.

2. List any investments, obligations, liabilities, or other financial relationships which constitute potential conflicts of interest with the position to which you have been nominated.

None except, possibly, my relationship as an employee of Boston University. I would not vote on any proposal which was made to the Institute for funding from a component of Boston University.

3. **Describe any business relationship, dealing or financial transaction which you have had during the last five years whether for yourself, on behalf of a client, or acting as an agent, that constitutes a potential conflict of interest with the position to which you have been nominated.**

None that I can think of

4. **List any lobbying activity during the past 10 years in which you have engaged for the purpose of directly or indirectly influencing the passage, defeat or modification of any Federal legislation or of affecting the administration and execution of Federal law or policy.**

None.

5. **Explain how you will resolve any potential conflict of interest that may be disclosed by your responses to the above items.**

I have explained above the potential conflict with grant applications from my university. Otherwise, I can think of no such conflicts in my case.

ALLEN WEINSTEIN

Personal

Born, September 1, 1937 in New York City; Married, 1969; Sons, Andrew (14) and David (12).

Academic Background

Ph.D., American Studies, 1967, Yale University (with honors: Egleston Prize in American History)
M.A., American Studies/History, Yale University
B.A., History/Philosophy; The City College (NYC) (with honors: Meade Prize in History)

Professional Appointments

President, The Center for Democracy (1/85 —)
University Professor and Professor of History, Boston University (5/85 --)
President, Robert Maynard Hutchins Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, University of California - Santa Barbara (3/84 -- 12/84)
(also, Editor, *The Center Magazine*)

Adjunct Professor in History and Political Science, University of California, Santa Barbara, 3/84 — 12/84

University Professor, Georgetown University, 1981 -- 1984 (appointed directly by President Timothy Healy; main teaching affiliation is in the History Department)

Executive Editor, *The Washington Quarterly*, Center for Strategic & International Studies, Georgetown University, 11/81 -- 12/83

Professor of History/Director of American Studies, Smith College, Northampton, Mass., 9/66 -- 12/81

Lecturer in History, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, 9/64 -- 9/66

Visiting Professor (part-time), Teachers College, Columbia University, graduate program, Spring, 1974

Visiting Professor, Brown University, Spring, 1972

Senior Fulbright Lecturer in American Studies, Australia, 1968 and 1971 (see Honors & Awards)

Instructor in History, George Washington University, Summer, 1964

Carnegie Foundation Teaching Fellow, The City College (New York), Summer, 1961

Professional Honors and Awards

Elected Member, The Society of American Historians, 1982 -- (an honor society, by invitation only, of 220 U.S. historians, "limited to those authors who have written at least one book of genuine distinction," which annually awards the Parkman and Nevins Prizes for the best book and dissertation, respectively, in the field)

Commonwealth Fund Lecturer in U.S. History, University of London, 1981 (the annual U.K. lecture and colloquium dedicated to a major set of historical studies by a U.S. historian); Theme: "Beyond McCarthyism: American Society, Civil Liberties, and the Internal Security Issue, 1917 - 1960"

Fellow, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (Smithsonian Institution), 1980

Citations for Perjury: The Hiss-Chambers Case

1. American Book Award Nomination in History, 1979
2. National Intelligance Study Center Best Book Award, 1978
3. Mystery Writers of America, "Edgar" Nomination in Non-Fiction, 1978
4. History Book Club, Main Selection, 1978
5. Book-of-the-Month-Club, Featured Alternate Selection, 1978

National Endowment for the Humanities Fellow and National Fellow, The Hoover Institution, Stanford University, 1977 -- 1978

Visiting Scholar, Stanford Law School, Fall, 1978

Massachusetts Council on the Arts and Humanities, Member, Humanities Advisory Panel, 1975 -- 1977

Visiting Scholar, Harvard Law School, Fall, 1975 (declined)

American Council of Learned Societies Fellow, January - December, 1975

Harry S. Truman Library Institute Annual Award, Tom E. Evans Grant, 1974 -- 1975

Senior Fulbright Lecturer, nine Australian Universities during two visits, 6/68 -- 8/68 and 9/71 -- 1/72

National Foundation for the Arts & Humanities Research Grant, Summer, 1968 (declined because of Fulbright Lectureship

Visiting Researcher, Harvard Law School, Summer, 1968 (declined for the above reason)

Binkley-Stephenson Prize, best article in *The Journal of American History*, April, 1968, awarded annually by the Organization of American Historians

Geprge Washington Egleston Prize for the best annual essay in American History, awarded by Yale University for my dissertation, 1967

Earhart Foundation Research Grant, Summer, 1966

Wilson Dissertation Fellow of Yale University, 1963 — 1964

George Robertson Coe Fellow in American Studies, Yale University, 1960 -- 1962

The Meade Prize in History, The City College, 1960

Professional Activities

Member, Program Committee, Pacific Coast Branch, American Historical Association, 1984 -- 1985

Member, Editorial Advisory Board, Foreign Policy Association, 1982 --

Member, Graduate Research Council, Georgetown University, 1981 -- 1983

Member, Georgetown University Review Committee on Institutes, 1982 -- 1983

Member, American Council of Learned Societies' Selection Committee for its "Fellowships for Studies on Modern Society and Values," 1981

Member, National Archivist's Scholars' Advisory Group on the Administration of FBI Records, 1981 -- 1982

Member, Editorial Advisory Board, *The Wilson Quarterly*, 1981 -- 1982

Organizer, Project in Contemporary U.S. Studies, Harry S. Truman Research Institute, Hebrew University (Jerusalem), 1978 -- 1980

Member, Editorial Board, *The Journal of American Studies*, (U.K.), 1977 -- 1979

Member, Humanities Advisory Panel, Massachusetts Council on the Arts & Humanities, 1975 -- 1977

Member, Joint American Historical Association - Organization of American Historians - Society of American Archivists' Committee on Historians and Archives, 1975 — 1977

Coordinator, Voice of America Forum Series Lectures, "America In Crisis...1776 - 1976" (State Department Bicentennial Lecture Program)

U.S.I.A. Guest Lecturer, May - July 1974, November 1975, June 1976, and June 1978 (Belgium, England, France, Finland, Germany, Greece, Israel, Italy, Spain, and Turkey)

Associate Coordinator, National Endowment for the Humanities' Bicentennial Project, "Courses by Newspaper" 1975 -- 1976

Participant, American Assembly, (Arden House), "The Records of Public Officials," April, 1975

Chairman, Program Committee, 1972 Convention of the Organization of American Historians (under OAH Presidents Richard Hofstadter and David M. Potter)

Major Publications

Freedom and Crisis: An American History (4th Ed. in preparation; Editions 1-3; Random House, 1974, 1978, 1981)

Harry S. Truman and the Founding of Israel (co-edited with Prof. Moshe Maoz, Hebrew University Press, 1981)

Perjury: The Hiss-Chambers Case (Knopf; Vintage paperback, Hitchinson Ltd. - UK: 1978 - 1980)

Between The Wars: American Foreign Policy from Versailles to Pearl Harbor (Berkley Paperback, 1978)

Prelude to Populism: Origins of the Silver Issue (Yale University Press, 1970)

American Negro Slavery: A Modern Reader (4th ed. to appear, 1985, Oxford University Press, co-edited with Prof. Frank Otto Gatell, 1968, 1973, 1979)

The Growth of American Politics, 2 vols. (Oxford University Press, co-edited with Profs. Frank Otto Gatell and Paul Goodman, 1972)

The Segregation Era, 1863 - 1954 (Oxford University Press, co-edited with Prof. Frank Otto Gatell, 1970)

American Themes: Essays in Historiography (Oxford University Press, co-edited with Prof. Frank Otto Gatell, 1968)

Random House Readings in American History, General Editor, 6 vols., 1970

Articles

(The following list does not include reviews which have appeared in various professional journals including The American Historical Review, The American Scholar Commentary, The Journal of American History, The Journal of American Studies, The Pacific Historical Review, Trans Action, and The Wisconsin Magazine of History. Nor does it catalogue a significant number of articles, reviews, and occasional pieces which have appeared in newspapers, popular magazines and journals of opinion, primarily since 1980).

"The Democratic Faith: New options in Central America," The Center Magazine, May/June, 1984.

Presidential Reputations: The Truman Image and the American Imagination," in Allen Weinstein and Moshe Maoz, eds., Harry S. Truman and the Founding of Israel... (Hebrew University Press, 1981).

"Open Season on Open Government," The New York Times Magazine, June 10, 1979.

"Freedom of Information and Carter Foreign Policy," The Washington Quarterly, Spring, 1979.

"In Defense of Perjury," The New Republic, April 29, 1978.

"Ethel and Julius Rosenberg," Dictionary of American Biography, 1951 - 1953 Supplement (1977).

"Was Alger Hiss Framed?: The New Evidence," The New York Review of Books, April 1, 1976; my response to comments on this article can be found in the same journal for these issues: "The Hiss Case: Replies to Critics," May 27, 1976; and "The Hiss Case: Another Exchange!," Sept. 16, 1976.

"The American Revolution as a Commemorated Event: Reflections on the Bicentennial," Revue Des Langues Vivants (Brussels), Spring, 1976.

"On the Search for Smoking Guns: The Hiss and Rosenberg Files," The New Republic, February 14, 1976.

"Nixon vs. Hiss," Esquire, November, 1975.

"Opening the FBI Files: An Interim Report," Smith Alumnae Quarterly, Feb. 1970; reprinted in the Los Angeles Times and St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

"The Symbolism of Subversion: Notes on Some Cold War Icons," Journal of American Studies, Summer, 1972.

"The Alger Hiss Case: A Reassessment," The American Scholar, Winter, 1971.

"Agit-Prop and the Rosenbergs," Commentary, July, 1970.

"Was There a 'Crime of 1873'? The Case of the Demonetized Dollar," The Journal of American History, September, 1967.

"The Vocation of Social Prophecy: Radical Critics of Gilded Age America," in Norman Harper, ed., Pacific Circle, II (University of Melbourne Press, 1972).

"The Bonanza King Myth: Western Mine Owners and Remonetization," The Business History Review, Summer, 1968.

"'Their Country': Radical Moralists and Other Critics of the Gilded Age," in The Concept of Radicalism in American History (Proceedings of the 1968 Yale University Conference on the Teaching of Social Studies).

Papers Delivered at Professional Meetings

(The following list does not include lectures delivered before a range of groups in the fields of international relations and government, mainly in the 1982 - 1984 period)

"The Concept of 'Generations' and the Truman-Eisenhower Era," Smithsonian Institution Lecture Series (1984 course on "20th Century America"), National Archives, October, 1984.

"American History and the Teaching of Civic Values," Guest Speaker, Kappa Delta Pi Education Honor Society's Convention, Toronto, April, 1984

"Public Myths and Democratic Practices: An American Perspective," Colloquium on "The Concept of Democracy," Council of Europe, Strasburg, March, 1983.

"Beyond McCarthyism: American Society, Civil Liberties and the Internal Security Issue, 1917 - 1960," University of London, January, 1981, Colloquium accompanying the Commonwealth Fund Lecture.

"Eisenhower's Presidency Reconsidered," American Historical Association, December, 1980 (Commentator).

"The Papers of Congress: A Neglected Source," Organization of American Historians, April, 1980 (chair and commentator).

"Richard Nixon: The Child in the Man," American Historical Association, December, 1979 (commentator).

"Reflections on the Historian and the Freedom of Information Act," Chief address, Federal Government Historians' annual meeting, October, 1978.

"Recent Trends in Law and American Society: The Freedom of Information Act," remarks to a panel on the subject at the September, 1978 National Archives conference on Law and American Society.

"'Wild About Harry'?: The Truman Image and the American Imagination," 30th Anniversary Conference, Harry S. Truman Research Institute (Hebrew University), June, 1978.

"Lessons of the Hiss-Chambers Case," Inaugural Lecture, Legal History Series, Rice University, April, 1978 (also delivered at Harvard Universtiy, CUNY Graduate Center, and University of North Carolina at Charlotte)

"Issues in the Rosenberg Case," Hoover Institute Seminar, October, 1977.

"Problems in American Law: The Freedom of Information Act Experience," Seminar, Center for the Study of Law and Society (University of California, Berkeley), October, 1977.

"Alger Hiss: Guilty or Innocent?" Organization of American Historians, April, 1977.

"The Historian and FBI Files," American Historical Associaiton, September, 1975.

"The 1890's in the United States: Decade of Crisis," Italian Association for American Studies Conference (Rome), November, 1975.

"The American Revolution as a Commemorated Event: Reflections on the Bicentennial," Inaugural Lecture, University of Liege (Belgium) American Studies Center, November, 1975.

"Privacy's Rights and Secrecy's Wrongs: The Historian and the Freedom of Information Problem," Featured Speaker, Northeast Council for the Social Studies, April, 1975.

"The Internal Cold War in England and America: A Comparison," Conference of Anglo-American Historians (London), July, 1974.

"The Historian and the Internal Cold War," Princeton University History Colloquium, November, 1973.

"The Alger Hiss Case: Issues of Evidence," Harvard Law School, Fellows in Law and the Humanities Program, November, 1973.

"The Cold War and History: Cultural Reactions in America and England," Harvard University Graduate Seminar in American Civilization, April, 1973.

"Political Repression in America: Myths and Realities," public lecture, Australian National University, August, 1971.

"The Symbolism of Subversion: Notes on Some Cold War Icons," British Association for American Studies Annual Conference, April, 1971, also delivered at the Columbia University Faculty Seminar in American Civilization, December, 1970.

"The Alger Hiss Case: A Reassessment," American Historical Association Annual Meeting, December, 1969.

"Teaching Black History: What and For Whom?" American Historical Association's Pacific Coast Branch, Annual Meeting, August, 1969 (commentator)

"Party Politics and the Silver Question, 1875 - 1878," Southern Historical Association, November, 1968.

"The Vocation of Social Prophecy: Radical Critics of Gilded Age America," Australian - New Zealand American Studies Association (Sydney), August, 1968.

"John Sherman, Treasury Policy, and the 'Crime of 1873': A Reinterpretation," Organization of American Historians, August, 1966.

"The Bonanza Kings, the Nevada Banks, and the Origins of the Silver Issue," Business History Conference, February, 1966.

"American Studies: Methods and Materials for Interdisciplinary Research," Washington Area History Conference, April, 1965.

In addition to the lectures previously listed, I have presented formal lectures or seminars at two-dozen universities in the following countries since 1970: Australia, Austria, Belgium, England, Finland, France, Germany, Israel, Italy, and Turkey (List supplied upon request). I have participated in a variety of conferences dealing with efforts to improve historians' access to the papers of public officials, including one at Arden House sponsored by the American Assembly in 1976 and another at New Harmony, Indiana in 1977 (whose proceedings were published in 1978, including a paper of mine entitled "Access and The Law"). I have testified on pending presidential papers legislation before the House Subcommittee on Government Information and Individual Rights, serving as an occasional advisor to this and other legislative groups dealing with public access issues. Finally, I have delivered public lectures (in addition to the ones previously described) at a number of universities since 1970 including Amherst College, Brandeis University, Clark University, Columbia University, Dartmouth College, Harvard University, Marquette University, Mt. Holyoke College, Scripps College, and the University of Toronto.

Public Service

Member-designate, Board of Directors, United States Institute of Peace (presidential appointment, 5/85)

Acting President, The National Endowment for Democracy, Washington, D.C., 12/83 -- 3/84

Executive Director, The Democracy Program, 11/82 -- 12/83 (on leave from Georgetown University to head this bipartisan program which involved leaders of the two major political parties, labor, and business in the study which developed the National Endowment for Democracy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Vice Chairman, U.S. delegation to the International Program for the Development of Communications (IPDC) meeting, Tashkent, USSR, 9/83

Vice Chairman and Coordinator, U.S. delegation to the UNESCO World Conference on Cultural Policies, Mexico City, Mexico, 7/82 -- 8/82

Coordinator, Bipartisan House-Senate International Communications Study Group (Co-Chairman, Congressman Dante B. Fascell and Senator Harrison Schmitt), CSIS, 1982 -- 1983

Advisor, Committee on the Future of the North Atlantic Assembly, Atlantic Council, 1982

Member, Editorial Board, The Washington Post, 1/81 -- 11/81

Creator & Host, Inside Washington (a PBS public affairs television program dealing with major national issues and institutions), 11/80 -- 6/81

Foreign Policy Advisor to Governor Ronald Reagan on International Communications issues, 6/80 -- 9/80

Coordinator, Ad Hoc Human Rights Committee for the Helsinki Review Meeting (CSCE), Madrid, 9/80 -- 11/80

Director, "Project on the Freedom of Information and Privacy Laws," The Twentieth Century Fund, 1977 -- 1980

Current Research - (Books In Progress)

Labyrinth: The Approach of War in FDR's Washington (a study which attempts to portray and evaluate the transformation within the Roosevelt Administration and in the city of Washington during the period between the beginning of World War II in Europe and the American entrance in the war after Pearl Harbor).

Democracy: An Essay (which deals with the major concepts, history, and current status of democratic institutions in the world).

The Haunted Wood: Civil Liberties and Internal Security in Modern America (an expansion of the themes developed in my Commonwealth Lecture, which studies the internal security issues's impact upon American government from World War One through the "McCarthy era")

All three studies are under contract with major publishers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

QUESTIONS FOR CANDIDATES FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

1. Have you received any instructions from the White House, the State Department, the Defense Department or the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency concerning reauthorization of the Institute? Are you familiar with the Administration-proposed amendments to the Institute and if so, what is your position?

2. The U. S. Institute of Peace Act authorizes the Institute to carry out a number of activities including research of its own, the funding of research at other institutions, education and training at the graduate and post-graduate levels, continuing education, information services, and the Jennings Randolph Center for International Peace. Which of these activities do you think should receive priority during the next six months? During the next year?

3. What sort of symposia and training programs will you initiate, and for whom, and to what purpose?

4. Do you have any ideas on how you might use grants to fund peace education?

5. What involvement, if any, have you had with the United States Institute of Peace prior to your nomination for its Board--during the long legislative history, and through your publications or speeches?

6. What will you do to ensure that the Institute's independence, reputation, or credibility is not compromised by covert intelligence action, any misuse of the Institute's potential access to classified materials or association with the various intelligence agencies?

7. This Committee has emphasized that the Institute is not to make U. S. foreign policy or to implement it. What will you do to ensure that it does not perform a policy making or implementation role?

8. It has been this Committee's intent that the Institute develop its own programs, courses, publications and public educational activities, that the Institute provide grants to existing institutions to strengthen and expand their programs, and that the Institute establish a series of satellite branches across the nation. What is your intention to develop the Institute along these lines?

9. What will you do to ensure that the public may fully participate in the Institute's programs, rather than creating or catering to an elite of specialists?

Boston University

The Center for Democracy
143 Bay State Road
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

November 6, 1985

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS POSED BY THE U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

ALLEN WEINSTEIN, DIRECTOR-DESIGNATE

1. I have received no such instructions and, answering the second part of the question, I am not familiar with any Administration-proposed amendments to the Institute. I have read, however, much of the newspaper coverage concerning the Institute (formerly 'Academy'), the legislative hearings, and a range of documents from concerned organizations on the Institute. Therefore, I recognize that there remain a host of arguments about its ideal structure and functioning, though the law seems perfectly clear on both as now exist.

2. I believe that the first responsibility of the Board of Directors should be to work diligently and expeditiously to establish a sound administrative structure and the necessary personnel to run the Institute. Any decisions on priorities for the Institute must be made only after a thorough analysis of congressional intentions, assessment of available funding, discussion and review among Board members of the most practical options we have to launch programs in the brief time frame called for in this question, and other related variables. At this moment, prior to a meeting of the Board, I could not provide a responsible answer--up or down--to 'voting' priorities among all of these worthy purposes.

3. Whatever symposia and training programs the Institute initiates, after careful review, must maintain standards of scholarly or analytic excellence and--in addition--must be sensitive to the importance of balanced presentations and broad-based representation among participating groups. Again, I believe that careful review by the Board of Directors and advise from the full range of groups and constituencies which have been concerned with the Institute from its inception must precede any concrete itemization on my part of specific programs.

4. I believe deeply in the importance of strengthening the knowledge and awareness of Americans at all educational levels concerning the issues related to the purposes of this Institute as stated in the legislation. A starting point

4. might be a request to the staff, once in place, for an expedited review of existing programs and meetings with a range of leaders in the fields of educational activity related to the Act in order to educate ourselves on the status of this field. At that point, the Board and staff would be in a position to determine intelligently the range of activity and allocation of resources available to us.

5. None.

6. While serving as Acting President of the National Endowment for Democracy during its formative months, I was instrumental in working on a bipartisan basis with members of Congress in both houses to assure that stipulations included in report language on NED to achieve the intentions implicit in this question were implemented. Specifically, I would propose to the Board of Directors at our first meeting, in consultation with those in Congress concerned with the functioning of the Institute and on a bipartisan basis, explicit stipulations to ensure that the Institute's independence, reputation, or credibility is not compromised by covert intelligence action, any misuse of the Institute's potential access to classified materials or association with the various intelligence agencies. This is a matter of highest importance in assuring the success of our mission.

7. I believe that, in addition to any explicit statements within the Institute's bylaws or agreements designed to insulate it from performing a policy making or implementation role, there must be regular consultations with appropriate members and staff in the Congress in both Houses and on a bipartisan basis which review the Institute's operations within the context of this concern.

8. It is the intention of this member-designate of the Board of Directors, should he be confirmed, to work with his colleagues in assuring that each and every aspect of the Institute's mandate as stated in the legislation be fulfilled, including those mentioned in the question. The problems which will inevitably confront this or any other Board selected for the Institute involve, of course, limited funds and vital competing priorities. Here, I believe that there must be a continuing informal dialogue with the members and staff of Congress--and with the Institute's various major constituencies throughout the countries--in arriving at a solid, long-range strategy through consensus for the allocation of resources and setting of priorities.

9. A significant proportion of funds received by the Institute should be allocated, in my opinion, to programs of broad public interest and involvement, always with keen sensitivity to maintaining balanced and informed presentations or approach. What mechanisms should be supported by the Institute's Board and staff to achieve

this critical goal of broad public participation remain to be determined once the Board has had time to examine the various options. My personal concern for the area of civic education in this field and others has many sources, including a teaching career and public lecturing over a quarter-century, as well as the writing and revision of a textbook for the college and university levels in the field of U.S. history (entitled Freedom and Crisis) along with editing a number of educational sourcebooks. One recent example of such concern is displayed in a "My Turn" column which I wrote for Newsweek earlier this year (August 5, 1985, copy enclosed) called "The Second Bicentennial," in which I argued explicitly for making the focus of the Bicentennial Commission's efforts those of broad public education.

The Second Bicentennial

MY TURN/ALLEN WEINSTEIN

James Madison, where are you when we need you? The Commission on the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution meets this week for the first time, nearly two years after President Reagan signed the bill that created it—but only one month after its members were appointed. By law, it has just two months left before it must submit specific plans to promote and coordinate the 200th anniversary of what is arguably the world's most influential written constitution.

Unless the commission quickly mobilizes its resources, we may not properly honor one of history's great political documents. What's the rush? you may ask. Less than a decade has passed, after all, since the days of "tall ships" and other bicentennial hoopla associated with the Declaration of Independence. Moreover, many groups are already engaged in studies, conferences and events related to 1787-89, including the Library of Congress, National Archives, the American Historical Association and the American Political Science Association.

Yet, if the upcoming observances do not range beyond the concerns of bureaucrats, lawyers and scholars, our constitutional celebration may become nothing more than a federal program for this "New Class"—and one best funded by the academic and legal professions themselves.

'Democracy Hall': Instead, the commission has both an obligation and opportunity to involve the broader American public in reaffirming our constitutional heritage. "The people made the Constitution," the great Chief Justice John Marshall once wrote, "and the people can unmake it. It is the creature of their own will, and lives only by their will."

So despite its late start, or perhaps because of it, the constitutional commission, which is chaired by Chief Justice Warren Burger, should consider some durable centerpiece that could command the interest and participation of most Americans. Why not a campaign, supported by the three branches of government, to establish in Washington (possibly near the Congress and Supreme Court) a museum and library devoted to explaining the history of democratic society from the ancient world to the present?

Through lively exhibits and public programs, "Democracy Hall," as some of us have come to call it, would examine graphically the lessons of democratic theory and practice from Greek and Roman civilization through the Western tradition to the newer democracies of the developing world. Since many Americans now reach adulthood lacking even a cursory understanding of the achievements, fragility and basic dilemmas of democratic society, such a bicentennial centerpiece could become a concrete and accessible way to revitalize the idea of civic education that students of my generation, at least, absorbed in the primary grades. It can become a vital force especially in the education of young and newer Americans on the first principles that govern their country.

> We the people should insist upon a party that is as worthy and imaginative as the Constitution itself.

How can such a hall be built? The task would be easier were the commission itself to adopt the idea, possibly through recommending a federal charter and organizing a campaign to create it through private subscription. At a time of intolerable federal budget deficits, its hallmark would be the conscious decision *not* to pursue government funding.

The American people, I think, would respond generously to a call from the commission to transform a one-time celebration into a usable monument to our most cherished values. In the absence of action by the commission, however, a "people's bicentennial" committee could create the hall through the combined efforts of schoolchildren, civic organizations, corporations, labor unions and political parties; in short, that network of "voluntary associations" on which America watchers from Alexis de Tocqueville to Jean-François Revel have remarked with wonder. Either way, let us begin!

In 1787 the process of drafting America's fundamental law took only four months, barely a fifth of the time wasted thus far in selecting the members of its commemorative conclave. The challenge now is to involve the American people directly in a range of events highlighting such themes as representative democracy, federalism, the separation of powers and individual rights. The challenges we accept now would help future generations celebrate the genius within the Constitution—the checks and balances that constrain the exercise of power while at the same time allowing sufficient scope to each branch of government to fulfill its mandate; an amendment process that blunts the passions of public anger, yet provides a structure for change that is sufficient to tomorrow.

Generational Communion: As we pay homage to a document important not only in this country but within every existing, or aspiring, free society, our evident resilience will not escape international attention. Our constitutional system's ability to weather successfully over two centuries a host of cultural, social and economic changes in American life fascinates both adversaries and friends.

"Superanniversaries" such as the bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution play a special role in history. By linking successive eras of Americans with their revolutionary forebears, they are vital acts of generational communion, without which national memory hardens into a vestigial artery and the past loses all meaning.

They are "festivals of national purpose," to borrow Daniel Boorstin's phrase, and as such deserve a degree of attentiveness from the American people which the bicentennial of 1787-89 has yet to receive. Otherwise, we face the dismal prospect of the U.S. Constitution ("intended to endure for ages to come," as Marshall correctly foresaw, "and consequently, to be adapted to the various *crises* of human affairs") reaching its third century with only a hurried and commonplace birthday party. We the people should insist upon an approach to this bicentennial at least as imaginative and worthy as the document being honored.

Weinstein is president of the Center for Democracy and professor of history at Boston University.

Senator **Stafford**. You have indeed. Thank you, Dr. Weinstein.

I am going to turn to my cochairman here, Senator Hatfield.

Senator Hatfield.

Senator **Hatfield**. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your courtesy, and I want to say that the temptation is to reminisce here with our colleagues on the long battle which they have waged, and I have had the privilege of being with them on bringing this Institute to reality.

I shall resist that temptation, and merely say that it is a very impressive panel that I see before me this morning, each person bringing unique background and experience. And it's very heartwarming to Professor Neuhaus, as representative of the panel, speak to the issue of the role of the mediating forces and structures in our society so that we get beyond purely the political and the institution of government.

I would only have one question that I would impose upon our time schedule this morning. I would like to ask Mr. Weinrod. And then I do have a series of questions that I would like to submit in writing to other members of the panel in order to secure a better understanding and information.

Mr. Weinrod, I notice that you are listed on our agenda here this morning as a director of foreign policy and defense studies of the Heritage Foundation.

Mr. **Weinrod**. That's correct, Senator.

Senator **Hatfield**. Mr. Weinrod, when the Peace Institute was being debated in the Congress, one of its most vocal critics was the Heritage Foundation. Its president, Edwin Fuelner, wrote in 1982 that the Senate sponsors, cosponsors, whom he called "the Jane Fondas of the Senate," were creating "nothing more than an expensive and glorified ground encounter session."

A 1984 Heritage Foundation publication called the Institute a "contrived program that presumes to know how to achieve a peaceful world." And that "spending several million dollars to study peace is just as likely to lead to unrealistic and dangerous expectations of what negotiations can accomplish."

And my question is: Faced with similar criticism, how would you, as a member of this Board, this Institute, respond to such statements?

Mr. **Weinrod**. Senator, first let me reiterate what I said in my statement. First, I would not be here this morning, I would not have come back from a business trip in Europe to be here today, if I did not believe that this Institute could play a useful, constructive role in better understanding of important questions relating to peace and conflict resolution.

Nobody at the Heritage Foundation or anywhere else speaks for me, and I don't presume to speak for anybody else. I can only tell you my own views on the situation. I happen to have, for many years, as is indicated in my statement, been involved in organizations—one, the American Council of Young Political Leaders, which I've been involved in for about 15 years, whose purpose is to provide for exchange activities between various countries, including—you were out at the time of the particular point I raised, but I have just been up in Vermont at a conference for 3 days with a Soviet delegation; I am going over as cochairman of a similar bipartisan delegation in December, because I believe such activities I'm also on the board of a Foreign Service student council here, which is involved with foreign students in this country. I am a realist, I believe, in terms of what U.S. foreign policy should be, but I am also at the same time always hopeful and idealistic in terms of the possibilities for the future. I do believe people can change their minds, I believe situations can change.

I believe that we should maintain our military capability at a very high level while at the same time we should always be communicating and open to discussion with anybody about any subject to see if there is some change which can lead to a resolution of a particular misunderstanding or conflict.

Senator HATFIELD. So you would dissociate yourself from these comments as representing your view about the Institute of Peace.

Mr. WEINROD. Absolutely; I speak for myself, and I don't speak for anybody else and nobody else speaks for me. At the same time, I would like to note for the record that I have the highest regard for Dr. Edwin Feulner and of his general views about U.S. foreign policy.

Senator HATFIELD. I thank you. I'm very happy to hear that, Mr. Weinrod.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I would be again tempted to engage in colloquy, as an ancient proconsul, when he asked the question: What is truth?—I would like to pose that as: What is peace?

But I know the time constraints.

Calling upon the great name of Robert Maynard Hutchins also is a very pleasurable thing for me this morning, as I had the privilege of being associated at a conference or two out at the center in Santa Barbara.

Dr. WEINSTEIN. I know that, Senator.

Senator HATFIELD. It's very nostalgic to hear of my great center of graduate study at Hoover, Dr. Bark.

Dr. BARK. Thank you.

Senator HATFIELD. It's also interesting to see what a marvellous combination of genes the Kirkpatrick family has to pass on the next generation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you, Senator Hatfield, very much indeed.

The comment you read from the president of the Heritage Foundation with respect to the character of Members of the Senate who supported this institute is sort of a blanket comment because it would have included 55 Members of the Senate.

Senator HATFIELD. Without regard to gender.

Senator STAFFORD. That's right. Or political affiliation.

Senator MATSUNAGA. Including Senator Stennis.

Senator STAFFORD. That's right. I note that my partner in the Education Subcommittee, Senator Pell, is here now. And if you have an opening statement you want to make, Senator.

Senator PELL. I have an opening statement, but I would ask the permission of the committee to insert it in the record as if read.

Senator STAFFORD. Without objection, we will place it in the record at an appropriate place.

Senator PELL. I am delighted to be here, and delighted that the board of directors of this institute has been appointed and that we are finally getting under way.

The appointees are obviously all extremely well-qualified, very well-qualified, indeed, all of a conservative cast, but we hope that as they get into this field more and more, and whether they are conservative or liberal will make no difference to their pursuit, their ardent pursuit, of conflict resolution.

As I understand it, they have not filed their disclosure statements, but they will be filed before we vote on them, is that correct?

Senator STAFFORD. I note we have got a live quorum, just showed up, Senator, which means we are probably going to have to break here rather shortly, and it would be the Chair's intention to submit his questions in writing, if that would be agreeable, gentlemen—and I will reserve that right for every member of the committee. The sooner we get replies, the more quickly we can act on your nominations.

Senator PELL. I would be glad, Mr. Chairman, to do the same, but I still wanted to be sure I understand correctly the procedure now. They will file disclosure statements before we actually vote on them, is that correct?

Senator STAFFORD. I would expect so; yes.

Senator PELL. Good.

Senator MATSUNAGA. Relative to the questions, Mr. Chairman, may we have the staff coordinate questions so that there will be no duplications? We might be asking the same questions. Written questions, that is.

Senator STAFFORD. Certainly. The Chair is willing to come back if there are questions you wish to address them personally, Senator Matsunaga.

Senator MATSUNAGA. Well, actually, I don't think we need to go to vote under the order for about another 15 or 20 minutes.

Senator STAFFORD. Yes, I think we will have a few minutes.

You wish to say something, Senator Randolph?

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you, Chairman Stafford. The expression "without thought of gender" will be a part of the record—I'm not sure who said it. This is no reflection upon the gentlemen who sit at the table. I was wondering if the President of the United States gave thought to the appointment of a woman as one of those who perhaps should be considered for such a position.

I want to add that there are 8 million more women of voting age in this country than there are men of voting age, and I hope we will remember to include them in policymaking programs such as the work of the Peace Institute.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Senator Randolph. And now, understanding that Senator Pell may have questions to be put in writing, we will recognize Senator Matsunaga for questions he may wish to ask personally.

Senator PELL. And I would add, if there is a moment or two left before we go over, I could joyfully fill it, but I think as Senator Matsunaga has taken such a leading role in this, he ought to be the lead-off questioner.

Senator STAFFORD. All right.

Senator **Matsunaga**. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Since so much reference was made here to Calvin Coolidge, I wonder if they are all reminded of what President Coolidge said once: "I have never been sorry for what I haven't said."

Senator **Stafford**. I remember his being quoted often when he said to the legislature in Massachusetts: "Above all things, gentlemen—be brief."

Senator **Matsunaga**. Well, Mr. Chairman, I must confess that, while I am an optimist by nature, I was much less optimistic before listening to this panel of nominees than I am now, which means, of course, that I am very much impressed. And we will be looking over your vitae as well as your disclosure reports, et cetera.

But I am especially pleased at the statement made by Dr. Moore, who will, as I understand it, eventually be the Chairman. With the thoughts that you have expressed, I think the Institute will continue and serve the purposes which Congress intended.

But I do have this question. As you probably know, the U. S. Institute of Peace Act provides that no member of the Board may participate in any action, decision, or recommendation with respect to any matter which directly or financially benefits him, or any organization to which he is connected.

And you realize that with this requirement of the law that you may need to extricate yourselves from some organizations you are connected with to comply with the law.

I take it that you are all familiar with this provision of the law. We'll go right down. Dr. Moore? Dr. Thompson? You can just nod. Dr. Kirkpatrick? You are familiar with this aspect of the law? Dr. Bark? Mr. Weinrod? Mr. Lovett? Mr. Neuhaus? Dr. Weinstein?

Senator **Stafford**. I think the record better show that all of the nominees nodded affirmatively.

Dr. **Moore**. May I just make a brief point, Senator, if I could?

Senator **Matsunaga**. Yes.

Dr. **Moore**. First, thank you for your kind comments on the statement. And then to say it would certainly be my intention on any decision in which I was involved in the Board that in any way raised that provision, to disassociate myself from any decision that might present any such conflict of interest under that.

I, of course, have worked for and continue to work for a number of educational institutions and others, such as the University of Virginia, and I think that my family would consider it poor form if I were to give up all of that and not bring home a paycheck.

So I did want to just make that clear for the record, that I would be disassociating myself from any decision of the Board which I believe would in any way have any conflict with that provision.

Senator **Matsunaga**. Dr. Thompson, during joint hearings on the U.S. Academy of Peace held in July 1982 by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the House Committee on Education and Labor, Dean Theodore Eliot of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy strongly opposed the establishment of a Federal agency devoted to peace research, education, and training.

Among other things, he said "I am convinced that existing public and private educational and private educational and research institutions can do the job."

He also expressed the opinion that a National Academy of Peace "would run contrary to the American tradition of pluralism in education."

How do you feel about that statement, and do you concur with that statement?

Dr. THOMPSON. At the time that he made the statement I disagreed with it, I told him I disagreed with it, I subsequently disagreed with it, and told him perhaps in what he did not take in an entirely friendly fashion that I rather associated myself with his predecessor's sentiments, Ambassador Edmund Golian, who had long been active in the effort to create a peace institute. So there we are.

Senator MATSUNAGA. I applaud you. And I will reserve questions I will put in writing to the others, Mr. Chairman.

Senator STAFFORD. We do have a rollcall, but we still have about 5 minutes.

I want the record to show that I am very much and favorably impressed with the statements of the nominees this morning.

I ask you one boiler-plate question. I assume that any one of you will be willing to come before any committee of the House or Senate of the U.S. Congress at their request. Is there anyone who would not?

I see no one nodding negatively.

Senator Pell.

Senator PELL. I would like to express my particular pleasure that Dr. Moore will be the Chairman. I have worked with him in past years on the law of the sea and a variety of projects. I believe that this group has a tremendous challenge, and in meeting the challenge I am sure that they will do a good job.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much. Gentlemen, thank you very much for your special cooperation in allowing us to get this done on a timely basis. We do have a rollcall going now, so we timed this just about perfectly.

We look forward to your service at the Institute.

And with that having been said, this committee meeting stands adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 11:18 a.m.)

○